Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

RUSSIA AMERICA AND OURSELVES

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month
The Government and the War *by* R. P. D.

British-Soviet Trade Union Unity
by J. BOWMAN
(Sec., Northumberland Miners' Association)

Russia, America and Ourselves
by IVOR MONTAGU

Joint Production Committees
by LEN POWELL
(Sec., Shop Stewards' National Council)

How "Leftism" Helps Hitler
by J. R. CAMPBELL

DECEMBER 1941 VOL. 23 No. 12

6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3 Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Amount received during November, 1941:

£50 : 3 : 8

While we must report our disappointment that, in spite of varying tactics of encouragement and deprecation, our Development Fund Total has dropped again, there are two mitigating circumstances: (1) that we have gone to press earlier than usual; (2) that many Discussion Groups report sums of different sizes being handed over to the Aid for Russia Fund. But still the number of Discussion Groups contributing is only just over ten per cent. of the total; many have never even sent us their penny per head levy agreed on many months ago.

Now, next month we must quite unashamedly beg you for Christmas presents. Such a wonderful response was received to our appeal for Birthday Presents that we KNOW it can be done.

Will you help us send the total soaring again?

	£	s.	d.
Nelson	1	0	0
R. R., N.W.11 ...		10	0
D. L.		5	0
F. Overington ...		2	6
Bacon Family ...		3	0
E. Goldsworthy ...		4	0
Grantham D.G. ...		10	0
F. Strange		2	0
D. P.		3	0
Paisley D.G. ...		5	6
R. F. B.	2	0	0
H. G. H.		10	0
C. M. F.		5	0
F. J. B.		1	6
R. Hutchinson ...		5	5
R. C. Allnatt ...		5	0
Beckenham D.G. ...		5	0
Wyld Green D.G....		3	0
A. Wall		5	0
Hillingdon D.G. ...		2	6
Cardiff D.G. ...		8	0
A. Nunn		2	0
E.		2	6
Harpenden D.G. ...		8	0
Ruislip D.G. ...		17	6
Bournemouth D.G.	1	0	0
C. Robson		5	0
F. D. O.		5	6
M. Southerden ...	1	0	0
Edinburgh D.G. ...		8	0
Gruzya Uchitiellya		15	0
M. Archbold ...		2	6
2 Aircraft Workers, Leicester ...		5	0
Hitchin D.G. ...		7	6
M. P. (Harrow) ...		10	0
A.P.V. Offices ...		2	6
4 Red Artillerymen		7	6
N. & E. Lipton ...		10	0
Hemel Hempstead D.G.		2	6
J. Harley		5	0
Hornchurch D.G....		5	0
P. H. Maurice ...	1	0	0
Penrith D.G. ...		15	0
W. Thomson ...		4	7
J. B. (Chelmsford)		5	0
Aberdeen D.G. ...		2	0
Chippenham D.G.		5	0
D. W. S. Daniels ...		3	6
Christchurch D.G.		16	6
Altrincham D.G. ...		6	6
Anon., Whitchurch		1	0
Swindon	1	0	0
Red Belgian Lance-Corporal... ...		3	0
Q. Z.		8	0
T. Shortt		2	4
Stamford Hill D.G.		13	6
Derby D.G. ...		2	6
Farnham D.G. ...		4	6
Corporal		10	0
E. C. Shell... ...		10	0
Horsham D.G. ...		2	0
Anon., Epsom ...		5	0
W. F. Lakin Smith		2	0
Worthing D.G. ...		5	0
R. R., N.W.3 ...	1	0	0
H. Eldridge ...		2	6
Woodford D.G. ...		5	0
Forest Gate D.G....		5	0
Edmonton D.G. ...		7	0
Orpington D.G. ...		4	6
M. J. Carritt ...	1	0	0
Socialist Sailor ...	2	10	0
H. M. Horne ...		10	6
M. Finesilver ...		5	0
Minehead D.G. ...		10	0
Dartford C.P. ...		10	0
H. A. F.	1	0	0
Didcot D.G. ...		15	0
Banstead D.G. ...		7	6
A. V.		2	0
Sir Peter Chalmers Mitchell	1	0	0
Political Levy ...		9	6
Red Glosters ...		15	0
Socialist Soldier ...		10	0
N. & E. Lipton ...		5	0
Socialist Sailor* ...	5	0	0
F. J. Brand ...		3	3
C. Robson		5	0
Marple D.G. ...		3	0
Hampstead D.G. ...		15	0
L. Birch		5	0
Mrs. Davey ...		2	6
Red Corporal ...	1	0	0
E. D. McCallum ...		5	0
H. A. R. D. ...		2	0
Bacon Family ...		3	0
D. Hughes... ...		6	0
A. Trowler... ...		6	0
P. G. Husbands ...		10	0
J. Harley		5	6
A. Miller		1	0
A. R. M.		5	0
G. Reddish ...		5	0
E. K. Kershaw ...		3	6
J. W. Porter ...		7	6
Wednesbury D.G.		4	6
R. Henry		3	0
T. Dearden ...		3	0
R. Pearson... ...		2	6
Enfield W. D.G. ...		6	0
Golders Green D.G.		4	4
Walthamstow D.G.		3	3
A. Hunter			6
Red N.C.O. and Privates		14	6
F. W. Sutton ...		1	6
Kilmarnock Comrades		10	0

* Because he was so disappointed at the small total last month. "It just won't do," he said.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

The Government and the War—Three Speeches—Stalin's Call to Action—Confidence and Resolution—United States Advance—Churchill's Firm Declaration—Negative Features—Parliamentary Critics—Shinwell's Attack—The Second Front—Causes of Dissatisfaction—Production Weaknesses—Contradictory Ministerial Statements—The Role of the Munichites—Warning Against Leftism—In Whose Interest?—National Unity—Right Conspirators and 'Left" Allies—Need of Working Class Unity.

NEW AND URGENT questions are arising of the political situation in Britain, of Britain's role in the war and of the further development of the war. Five months have passed since the opening of the German-Soviet battle. These five months will stand, by the strength of the Soviet resistance and by the formation of the common front of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, as the turning point of modern history and of the international struggle against Fascism. But the situation remains grave, and the questions now in front require imperative decisions. The full world scope of the war is only now opening out. The partial check to the original Nazi plans in the Eastern campaign raises all the more sharply the strategic questions of the next thrusts of the Nazi offensive and the action of the Allies. While the unrest grows in occupied Europe, the Nazi diplomatic manœuvres are pressed forward to organise their satellite governments and bases of support in their " new order," as well as to reach out to anti-democratic sections in Britain and the United States with peace hints in order to sow the seeds of division between the democracies. The British offensive in Libya opens out another front against the Axis Powers. At the same time the pressing need of the speediest possible development of the Second Front on the Continent of Europe is more and more widely recognised. The advancing participation of the United States, on the one side, and of Japan, on the other, extends the scope of operations and opens new strategical perspectives. With all these developments the question of the active role of this country, which was already of crucial importance in the first five months, and the failure to solve which underlay the Nazi advance during these months, now becomes more than ever urgent as the key question of the further development of the war. But this question is intimately bound up with the political situation at home, the mobilisation of the people and the strengthening of the Government as the effective instrument of the Alliance on the basis of the broadest national unity for the fulfilment of the common tasks of the Alliance.

Vol. XXIII. No. 12. **CONTENTS FOR DECEMBER** December, 1941.

	Page
Notes of the Month	
The Government and the War by R.P.D.	469
British-Soviet Trade Union Unity by J. BOWMAN	478
Russia, America and Ourselves	
The War Within America by IVOR MONTAGU	481
Joint Production Committees by LEN POWELL	486
How " Leftism " Helps Hitler by J. R. CAMPBELL	492
The Liversidge Case. by " LAWYER "	497
A.R.P. To-day by J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.	498
Document of the Month	
Anglo-Soviet Trade Unions Committee	499
Book Reviews—	
No more than a Quarry ..	500

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RECENT SPEECHES of Stalin on November 6 and 7, of Roosevelt on November 6, and of Churchill on November 10 and 12 showed on a broad canvas the perspective of the present international situation. They showed the growing unity and strength of the forces of democracy allied for the destruction of Nazism; they showed the firm and solid grounds of confidence in victory. But they showed with no less urgency the serious character of the present situation, the dangers in front and the tasks which require to be fulfilled. Immediately following these speeches, the debate in the House of Commons revealed the growing concern of public opinion in this country with the necessity for strengthening the policy of the Government for the fulfilment of these aims. The controversy between the Government and the critics occupied the centre of the political situation. This controversy is a controversy within the united framework of a common purpose. But it is a controversy which turns on urgent practical questions, both of policy, and of the composition of the Government. These questions need to be frankly faced: for the whole future depends on their solution.

STALIN'S SPEECH FROM the heart of Moscow defying the assault of the enemy, on this memorable twenty-fourth anniversary of the Russian revolution, breathing the spirit of indomitable confidence of the entire Soviet people, and inspiring new energy and certainty of victory in every nation struggling against Nazism, set out with complete plainness the facts of the present situation which must govern our approach to the problems of every part of the common front of this fight. There was no concealment of the harsh realities of the present position; the "serious danger" which "far from diminishing has, on the contrary, increased"; the one and three quarter millions casualties of the Soviet forces in four months, even though inflicting four and a half million casualties on the invading forces; the loss of territory, the destruction of towns and cities and the plunder of resources; and the threat to Leningrad and Moscow. The reasons for the Nazi advance were no less plainly stated. First, "the absence of a Second Front in Europe against the German fascist troops"; "there are no armies of Great Britain or the U.S.A. on the European Continent at present which are waging war against the German fascist troops," with the result that "the situation now is such that our country is waging a war of liberation alone, without military aid from anyone." Second, the superiority of the enemy in equipment. "We still have fewer planes than the Germans"; "we have several times fewer tanks than the Germans"; "the Germans are producing a far greater number of tanks because they now have at their disposal not only their own tank industry, but also the industries of Czechoslovakia, Holland, Belgium and France." These are the harsh facts which point with inescapable clearness to the pressing tasks for every partner in the Alliance, and especially for us in Britain.

BUT STALIN AT the same time showed no less clearly the positive grounds for the certainty of final victory. He showed the failure of the Nazi plans: first, to achieve a lightning victory over the Soviet Union and reach the Urals in six weeks to two months; second, to draw Britain and the United States into a universal coalition against the U.S.S.R.; and third, to create a breach within the Soviet Union and disintegrate it from within. Exposing the reactionary, barbarous and bestial character of Nazism, he showed how this would lead, not to its automatic collapse, but, by uniting all honest people and progressive forces against it for its extermination, to its inevitable final doom: "the rout of the German imperialists and their armies is inevitable." He built this conclusion on three basic factors. First, "the instability of the European rear of imperialist Germany," the basis of whose "New Order" in Europe "constitutes a volcano

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ready to erupt at any moment and bury the German imperialist house of cards." Second, "the instability in the German rear of the Hitlerite invaders," since "the German people have taken a profound turn in opposition to the war, and are in favour of the liquidation of the war": "the German rear of the German troops represents a volcano ready to erupt and bury the Hitler adventurists." Third, the coalition of the U.S.A., Britain and the U.S.S.R., with their superior potential resources and strength: "the coalition of the U.S.A., Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. is a real thing which is growing and will continue to grow for the benefit of our common cause of liberation." These dominating factors of the international situation necessarily govern our approach to every problem, and have their important bearing on the political situation in this country.

ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH, AND the subsequent adoption of the revision of the Neutrality Act, showed that the United States under the leadership of Roosevelt is moving closer to a fighting partnership in the Alliance. There is no room for under-estimation of the obstacles or of the strength of the opposition forces. The earlier fantastic calculations of the volume of supplies which could be available from America in the near future have at last given place to a more realistic recognition of the hard facts. It is obvious that a total export of 533 planes in August, to be divided between Britain, the Soviet Union and China, is still a very small proportion in relation to the losses of 5,316 Soviet planes in three and a half months, or of 9,000 Nazi planes in the same period; while the estimated production of 250 light tanks a month, 50 medium tanks, and no heavy tanks as yet bears no relation to the 30,000 tanks which Lord Beaverbrook stated the Nazis to have had when they attacked the U.S.S.R. These figures need to be borne in mind, no less than the political difficulties, in understanding the step-by-step progress of Roosevelt's successive statements when contrasted with the lightning advance and urgency of the war situation. But the present modest role of the United States in the war should not blind us to the gigantic future role which it can play. The significance of Roosevelt's explicit declaration that "the real end—the inescapable end of United States policy is the destruction of the Hitler menace"; the participation in the Moscow Conference decisions; the thousand million dollar loan without interest to the Soviet Union under the Lease-Lend Act, following the similar loans to Britain; the co-operation in a common stand in the Far East; and the arming of the merchantmen and patrolling of sea routes: these are already big factors in the world situation, whose significance is well understood by the Nazi rulers. The development and strengthening of British-Soviet co-operation with the United States, and the understanding of the difficulties to be overcome by Roosevelt and the American anti-Hitler forces, need also to be borne in mind in approaching the problems of the internal situation in Britain.

CHURCHILL'S SPEECHES AT the Mansion House and in the House of Commons were important for the strengthened position of Britain which they proclaimed, for the firm declaration in relation to Japan and the Far East, and the emphatic rejection of any question of negotiations with Hitler or the Nazi regime. The claim to a very greatly increased strength of Britain ("we are infinitely stronger than we were a year ago, or even six months ago"), to air parity with Germany ("we have an air force which is at least equal in size and numbers, not to speak of quality, to the German air power," an estimate evidently based on the heavy destruction of Nazi air effectives by the Soviet air force, but not making clear how far relative future rates of production are taken into account), and to a relatively strengthened shipping position (in the sense of a diminution of net losses, after taking new building into account, but not yet claiming the overtaking of losses by replacement), obviously increase the favourable strategic possibilities

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for British military action; and the offensive in Libya may be regarded as a first expression of this. The warning to Japan, the cordial reference to China and the pledge of support to any action of the United States in the Far East helps forward at a critical moment the formation of the front against aggression in that region. Most important of all was the unreserved re-assertion that "the British nation and His Majesty's Government at the head of that nation, in intimate concert with the Governments of the great Dominions, will never enter into any negotiations with Hitler or any party in Germany which represents the Nazi regime." This forthright declaration in the present international situation, with the prospect of new diplomatic manoeuvres of the Nazi and pro-Nazi forces to split the democracies, and in contrast to the equivocal records of other leading political personalities and potential rivals, it is obviously of key importance in judging the present political situation in this country from the point of view of the maximum strengthening of the British-Soviet Alliance.

ON THE OTHER hand, the speeches made no reference to the main controversial issues of war strategy agitating public opinion. There was no reference in either of the speeches, or in any of the declarations of Government spokesmen in the parliamentary debate, to the explicit statement of Stalin's speech with regard to the Second Front on the Continent of Europe, that "the absence of a Second Front against the Germans in Europe renders the position of the German army considerably easier" and that such "a Second Front on the Continent of Europe" "must appear in the nearest future." There was no reference to the continued refusal to declare war on Finland, Rumania and Hungary, despite the official request of the Soviet Government. A general onslaught on the "critics" was accompanied by a rejection of the demand for a reconstruction of the Government or for any basic reorganisation on the production front, a defence of the continued inclusion of the Munichite Ministers, and a declaration that no changes in the Government were "contemplated at present." The latter statement, however, left the door open for future changes by adding that "from time to time the force of events makes changes necessary."

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE on the Address revealed a widespread critical note which reflected the rising tide of public feeling on many issues of the conduct of the war, the position on production and the composition of the Government. The controversy between the Government and the critics came to occupy the centre of attention. One M.P. after another bore witness from their experience to the widespread concern and disquiet in the nation and the sense of "frustration" arising from what was felt to be the inadequate action of the Government. James Griffiths, speaking on behalf of the Labour Party, declared:

> "From my own experience, not only in my constituency, but also in connection with my political work throughout the length and breadth of the country, I find the nation is disturbed because it feels that we are not 'all out' on this job. There is intense admiration for the courage of the Soviet forces and the fortitude of the Soviet people. Coupled with that feeling is a sense of frustration arising from the desire to help more effectivly than we are doing at the moment."

In the sphere of production he expressed the need for "central co-ordination, central drive and central planning." Another Labour M.P., T. M. Sexton, stated:

> "The Russians are passing through Gethsemane itself, and there must be no suspicion, as there is lurking in the country to-day, that Britain, her Ally, is following her afar off."

From another angle D. N. Pritt, speaking on behalf of the People's Convention movement, and voicing the demand from many meetings and demonstrations for the removal of those Ministers who had shown themselves by their public expressions "extremely lukewarm towards our alliance with the U.S.S.R.," made

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clear that this demand was based on support for the Government and the desire to strengthen it:

> "The People's Convention movement—so many of whose meetings I have addressed as one of the most prominent people in that movement, and which represents such a large body of opinion on these lines—clearly and definitely support the Prime Minister as long as he leads the Government in fighting for the progressive cause side by side with the U.S.S.R. I and those who think with me support the Government, but we utter very strong criticism and a demand that the Government should be cleaned of these very unfortunate elements."

THE WIDEST PUBLIC attention was aroused by the speech of E. Shinwell, of the Labour Party Parliamentary Executive, who raised sharply the questions of the Second Front, of production and of the necessity for the reconstruction of the Government. He said:

> "The policy of this Government, in my judgment, is incapable of winning the war. Many other Members are saying privately what I now say in public. That there resides in the hearts of the Government an intense desire for victory I do not doubt. But that feeling must be translated into action. Unless the Government show by their actions that every fibre of their being is strained to destroy the enemy, unless they are ready to set aside every obstacle in our path, they are a hindrance to the nation and to the war effort. The essence of victory lies in speed, in audacity, in taking risks and in dauntless courage. Unless the Government can supply these virtues, they will, in the opinion of the country, have outstayed their welcome."

This sharp formulation, following on previous speeches in the country, was widely interpreted as a challenge to the Government as a whole, and in this respect parted company from other speeches on the left; the consequent controversy, which was intensified by the personal character of the Government spokesman's reply, to a certain extent obscured from view the important concrete issues and questions raised in the speech.

WHAT UNDERLIES THIS widespread critical note, which undoubtedly reflects a considerable body of opinion in the country, despite the complete national unity of all sections of the people in support of the British-Soviet Alliance, and the universal recognition and acclamation of the achievement of the Government in carrying through the Alliance, as well as the Moscow Conference decisions and other measures? The main reason is beyond question the sense of indignation and frustration at the policy of inaction for the past five months: that five months of the gigantic battle in the East, on which the fate of all depends, should have passed with no military action from Britain, and that even the organisation of supplies should only have been begun after long and unnecessary delays. After all the glib explanations of impotence had been made, it could not but be galling to reflect that, while the Red Army could engage nine-tenths of the Nazi forces, the entire British Empire could not face the remaining one-tenth in the West, or even put into the field alongside the Soviet Union as much forces as petty Finland could put into the field alongside Hitler, thirty divisions. It was galling that after three months, when at the outset it had been so freely declared that Hitler had committed the fatal blunder of entering into a war on two fronts, the *Voelkischer Beobachter* of September 30 should be able to boast that there was no need for alarm since "we have no two-front war." Nor was this indignation lessened by the explanations of Government Ministers, especially when the most vocal were precisely those who had been responsible for the disastrous Munich policy in the past, and whose wisdom consisted of elaborate proofs of the impossibility of attempting anything save a static defensive waiting policy (ominously recalling the tone of the French official statements of 1939-40) or rebukes to the public for daring to concern themselves with affairs which should be left to the infallibility of those who over a succession of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years had produced the chain of Munichs, Finland expeditions, Norways, Dunkirks and Cretes, and now dared to use these failures as the alibi for present inaction under totally altered conditions. Fuel was added to the flames when it became clear that these Ministerial statements had enabled Hitler to transfer half a million men from the West to the East. The indignation was heightened when successive Soviet public statements made clear the Soviet viewpoint.

THAT THE GOVERNMENT here parted company from the main body of public opinion is manifest from all available evidence, not merely from spokesmen of the left, or from all signs of expressions of opinion in the factories or the forces, but as reflected equally in leading press organs from the right to the left. The Gallup poll in October revealed only 44 per cent. expressing themselves as "satisfied with the Government's conduct of the war," or a sharp drop from 58 per cent. in June (a figure which had been previously steady within variation of 3 per cent. since the outbreak of war); while only 29 per cent. expressed themselves as satisfied that advantage had been taken of the opportunities provided by the German attack on the Soviet Union. At the same time it was no less significant that the same Gallup poll revealed 84 per cent. as continuing to approve Churchill as Prime Minister, a relatively stable figure with a very small drop from 87 per cent. in June. These figures are instructive. The 84 per cent. is expressive of the overwhelming national unity behind the Prime Minister as the embodiment of national unity and determination in the war for complete victory over Hitler. The 44 per cent. and 29 per cent. reveal the disquiet over the actual conduct of the war, and, in particular, over the utilisation of the opportunities provided by the Nazi offensive on the Soviet Union. The relation of these figures clearly indicates the necessary policy to be pursued on the question of the Government, that is, the strengthening of the Government around the present Prime Minister, and the strengthening of its policy. The new Libyan offensive will be universally welcomed as a step forward towards a more active policy. At the same time it needs to be recognised that the question of action on the Continent of Europe, the importance of which was emphasised in Stalin's speech, remains to be solved at the earliest possible moment.

THE SECOND REASON for the widespread dissatisfaction lies in the sphere of production and the home front. The British-Soviet Alliance and the epic fight of the Soviet people has powerfully stimulated enthusiasm and the readiness for intensified effort and sacrifices in the field of production. The strength of this appeal was shown in Tanks Week, with the 20 per cent. increase in production. But this stimulus has been weakened, first, by the policies of inaction and the absence of a direct fighting front of the forces of this country, with the consequent growth of suspicion of the effective fulfilment of the Alliance; and second, by the continuing disorganisation, waste of resources and labour, evidence of monopolist restriction of production, lack of planning, failure of effective mobilisation of man-power, inequality of sacrifice, weakness of the Government before the vested interests, etc. There is still very far from serious organisation for total war, or even a systematic approach towards its achievement. Even by the standards of a capitalist country at war, it is a startling contrast with the last war, and a measure of the extent of decline that, with still a very considerably lower total of the armed forces than at the end of the last war, with a larger population by over four millions, and with very much more advanced technique, it should have been recently held forth as a matter for boasting that the level of war production had reached the equivalent of the last quarter of the last war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT CANNOT BUT be a matter of grave concern that in a war of steel, the production of steel in this country in the third year of the war should be below the level of 1937, and that, with the Nazi organisation of steel production in Europe three to four times the level of this country, further restriction should be announced by the steel monopoly masquerading as the Government's Steel Control. The disquiet has not been lessened by the contradictory character of Ministerial statements, vacillating between bombastic optimism and forecasts, repeatedly proved baseless, of overtaking Nazi production in six months, and pessimistic declarations of desperation; at one moment rebuking Sir John Wardlaw-Milne for his estimate that production could be increased and needed to be increased by 25 per cent.; and then declaring through Bevin, that production must be increased 40 per cent., and even, in the speech of Beaverbrook at Manchester in November, calling for the September figure of production to be doubled in November ("Whatever your production was in September, I ask you to double it in November"). With these questions must be associated the wages policy of the Government and the demand for stabilisation on the basis of the extreme low rates of wide sections, which is leading to an increasingly menacing situation in many industries; the food policy, with its continued glaring inequalities; the failure to tackle the practical problems to make possible the wide entry of women into industry; and a host of associated questions in social policy. The overhaul that is here needed requires a strengthening of the Government, and a strengthening of the progressive forces in the Government.

BUT THE SHARPEST immediate cause of dissatisfaction, closely bound up with the preceding concrete issues, has arisen from the continued presence and influential role in the Government, out of all proportion to any following in the country, of the most notorious reactionary political representatives who have been identified with the pro-Hitler policies in the past, and whose expressions since June have shown them to be, in the words of D. N. Pritt, "extremely lukewarm towards our Alliance with the U.S.S.R.," exerting their influence in a direction contrary to the interests of the Alliance, and most vocal in opposing every popular demand for the more effective prosecution of the war. After the experience of the Fifth Column in other countries, and its methods of penetration through precisely such reactionary upper-class representatives in high positions, the continuance of such men in places of power in the present conditions would be a scandal, even if there had been no overt sign of their role since June. But indignation is raised to fever heat when the speech of a Halifax serves to show the green light to Hitler to move his troops from the West to the East; when the "indiscretion" of a Moore-Brabazon, expressing the conscious outlook of a whole section of reactionary upper class opinion, is hushed up by the Government, in place of leading to his removal; or when a Hoare returns from Madrid to plead for more millions of money for Hitler's ally, Franco. No calculations of party alignment can justify the retention of these men in their present positions, where they can do untold damage at the most critical points of the developing situation. If a Casado or a Prieto could undermine Spanish Republican resistance, if the introduction of a Petain or a Weygand was the beginning of the end in France, what must we say of the presence of far more menacing representatives in a Government in this country when in alliance with the Soviet Union? The healthy instinct of all working class and democratic opinion, in calling for the removal of the Munichite Ministers, is a demand, not for the weakening, but for the strengthening of national unity.

ON THE OTHER hand, there are voices to be heard on the left and in the working class movement which seek to extend this demand to an attack on the whole Government; which declare that Churchill and Moore-Brabazon must be treated as equal; that the responsibility for whatever policies are criticised by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the left must rest with the Prime Minister and the Government as a whole; that their class interests prevent any effective fulfilment of the Alliance with the Soviet Union; and that the aim must therefore be the bringing down of the present Government and the establishment of a Government of the Left as the only effective instrument for the fulfilment of the British Soviet Alliance. This demand enters into very different and very dangerous territory. This demand whatever the intentions of its promoters, is equivalent to the demand for the destruction of national unity, and therefore for the destruction of the indispensable basis of the British-Soviet Alliance; it is a demand which seeks to turn the attack on the pro-Hitler forces into an attack on the anti-Hitler bourgeoisie; and therefore it is a demand which plays straight into the hands of the Munichites and the friends of fascism.

IT IS ONLY necessary to imagine, in the existing relations of political forces, what would in fact be the character of any conceivable alternative Government under any alternative Prime Minister such as would be capable of retaining the support of the present parliament, to the existing Churchill Government, to see that such a change could in fact only mean a change from the principal representative of anti-Nazism to far more dubious representatives, and would in fact mean and be universally interpreted as a weakening of the national resolve and determination to fight to the end against Hitler, and a destruction of stability behind the policy of the British-Soviet Alliance. It is only necessary to imagine the effect, in every country of the world, of a weakening or downfall of the Churchill Government in this country at the present critical stage of the war, to see that that effect would be to create consternation in every country friendly to the British-Soviet Alliance, while it would be hailed as the most signal victory yet won in Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. The understanding of these political realities of the present international and national situation is of such vital importance for the left that it is necessary to dwell upon this issue.

THE UNQUALIFIED INTERESTS of the working class and of the left in the present situation require the promotion and maintenance of the broadest national unity in support of the policy of the British-Soviet Alliance, and the support and maintenance of a Government representing this national unity, representative, therefore, of the main political forces supporting the Alliance Such national unity means the unity of the working class, of the left, of the democratic movement, of all sections of the people with all those sections of the ruling class who, for whatever reasons, and with whatever ulterior aims, stand for the common aim of the defeat of Hitler and support the Alliance with the Soviet Union for this purpose. Even if the working class and democratic forces were far stronger in the present scale of political strength than they are at present, even if they held a dominant position, they would still correctly seek to maintain the alliance with the anti-Hitler bourgeoisie, just as the powerful militant working class and left movement in Republican Spain maintained the alliance with the far weaker democratic bourgeoisie, represented by Negrin. But in fact the present relations of political forces are extremely different. The representatives of the left are still weak in the present political balance. The representatives of the right, the reactionary Munichite forces, at heart hostile to the Alliance, are powerfully placed and active.

IT IS NECESSARY to recognise that these reactionary forces are showing increased activity at present. They sniff the possibilities of the present political situation. They can have no hope of winning direct mass support for their anti-popular and basically pro-fascist policies. But they can hope to take

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dvantage of political unsettlement and weakening of the Government through opular dissatisfaction and leftist agitation in order to prosecute their own inister designs. It is no accident that, at the moment of rising popular indigiation with many aspects of the Government's policy, the 1922 Committee, the nner caucus of Munichite Conservatism, should nominate Sir John Anderson s Churchill's successor. It is no accident that, at the same time as critics on he left have expressed their dissatisfaction with Churchill, such a representative s Sir Herbert Williams, M.P., closely connected with the inner machine of the Chamberlainite Conservative Central Office, should come out with an attack on Churchill. Munichism has always relied on a motley group of associates to serve its purpose in confusing popular opinion, as in the days of Munich: on pacifism, on all varieties of Leftism, on I.L.P.-ism, as well as on the direct pro-Nazi agency in the working class, Trotskyism. The same sinister combination is at work to-day. It is essential that all serious left opinion must be aware of these forces and not fall into their trap. The fight for the strengthening of the Government, and for the urgent issues demanded by the left, must be conducted within the framework of national unity and on the basis of support of the Government representative of national unity for the fulfilment of the tasks of the Alliance.

SUCH A CAMPAIGN requires the mobilisation of the broad common movement throughout the country of all sections of the people in support of the aims associated with Anglo-Soviet unity, the participation of the fullest strength of this country in the joint fight, the overcoming of all obstacles to maximum production, and the strengthening of the Government for these aims. When Churchill declared, at the same time as denying the contemplation of any immediate changes in the Government, that " the force of events from time to time makes changes necessary," it is for the popular movement to help to provide " the force of events." But the effectiveness of such a common front requires above all one factor which is still absent, and whose absence is the main source of weakness of the present political position—the united activity of all sections of the labour movement. The establishment of British-Soviet trade union unity is a big step forward. But the necessary counterpart of international unity is unity at home. There are some signs, even behind the barbed wire of the still continuing rigid official barriers, of a new spirit of co-operation overriding the barriers in many quarters. Such co-operation needs to be encouraged and assisted in every possible way and through every means. The paralysis of the working class movement means the paralysis of the progressive forces in the political situation. The revived activity and unity of the working class movement and of all working class organisations, within the broad national front, is the key to advance in the political situation in Britain, for the strengthening of the Government and the fulfilment of the policies essential to British-Soviet victory.

R. P. D.

Bound Volumes for 1941 will be put in hand immediately. Many readers were unable to secure Bound Volumes for 1940 through not applying in time. Prices are as follows:

Bound Volume, 1941, in handsome dark blue binding with gold lettering, similar to previous years .. 10s. 6d.

Bound Volume, 1941, in Part Exchange for at least 10 loose copies (May, June and October MUST be sent) 6s. 0d.

Postage of 8d. must be added in all cases.

We must ask readers to let us have their orders, remittances and loose copies (in good condition, fit for binding) not later than December 15th, 1941.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British-Soviet Trade Union Unity

by J. BOWMAN

(Secretary, Northumberland Miners Association).

THE decision of the Trades Union Congress to form a single Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, followed by the October meetings in Moscow and the Eight Points Agreement reached there, is of outstanding importance.

When this issue was discussed at the Trades Union Congress, 1941, at Edinburgh, we of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain felt a special interest. For, although in the past relations between the Trade Unions of Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. had been the common concern of the whole British Trade Union Movement, the Miners had an especially close fraternal connection with the Russian Miners dating from the days when the British Miners took steps in 1919 to stop intervention against the U.S.S.R.

As Miners we remember with a deep sense of gratitude the demonstration of working-class solidarity by the workers of the U.S.S.R., during the struggle of 1926. The memory of that epic struggle still lives to-day in the hearts and minds of the British Mineworkers, and the memory of the manifestation of fraternal solidarity during that period on the part of our Russian Comrades is ever green.

In support of our deep fraternal connection we have sent several delegations of leading members of our Federation to the U.S.S.R. In 1937 I myself had the honour to be a member of one of such delegations. How well I recollect the deep impression made upon me and the convictions which I carried away of the bright future of the Soviet worker.

The Russian Miners have also visited our shores. Delegates to the Annual Conference of the M.F.G.B., held at Whitley Bay in 1938, speak still of the dynamic personality of Nikolenko, the President of the Don Bas Miners Union, who attended the Conference as fraternal delegate. How prophetic the words of his address to that Annual Conference of British Mineworkers appear to-day:

> "The working class of whatever Country, including the Miners of Great Britain, must grasp the simple truth that if to-day the Fascist savages kill off hundreds of thousands of people in the territories of Spain and China, they have no guarantee that to-morrow swarms of Fascist bombers will not bomb the workers' quarters in other countries."

None of us realised when we parted from that splendid representative of the new Russia that by the Autumn of 1941 the Nazis would have achieved such gigantic victories on land, that the vast industrial resources of Europe would have fallen into their hands. None of us expected that 1941 would see his Country at War as our gallant ally, facing the full brunt of the fighting on land.

What do these tremendous changes which have taken place mean to us?

In the first place, the German conquest of Europe has resulted in a vast increase in their deathly striking power. To-day we fight not the Nazi Germany of 1939, but a Germany which has mobilised the whole of European industry behind her war effort. To-day we oppose a Nazi Germany which, by conquest and power, has secured non-German military Allies. The Finnish, Hungarian, Rumanian and Italian armies alone must in the aggregate be equal to the British Army itself—aye, far more than equal. If we were fighting that combination alone, as a British Empire, without the military aid of the U.S.S.R., coupled with the material aid of the United States of America, we would be fighting not for victory, not for the right to build a new world; we would be fighting for our sheer existence and for the right to exist as an independent nation.

Underlying all our War Effort the realisation of these facts is of first importance. Let us hail the glorious struggle of the Soviet Union, but let us also realise that it enables us for the first time to see with any measure of clarity the prospect of decisive victory over Fascism provided that the people of Britain are prepared to realise the urgency of the position and to throw

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all their weight, without stint, into the struggle, on land, by sea, and in the air.

I feel that the great essential to-day is that we should be realistic, that we should appreciate that even with the Soviet Union as our ally we cannot triumph unless and until our Industrial Power and our Man and Woman power are so mobilised that everyone is playing his or her part in the war effort, and all of the obstacles in the way of vastly increased production are swept away.

To-day our Soviet Ally is throwing itself entirely into the struggle against Fascism. The destruction of the Dnieper Dam, the greatest piece of engineering in recent European history, is the living proof that the Russian worker will shrink from no sacrifice. May that work of destruction be an inspiration to us all to go ahead and destroy every obstacle that stands in the way of the greatest possible flow of war material for our common Victory.

We must not only insist on an unsurpassed quantity of war material being produced, but also upon its speedy use. It may be held by military strategists that the theory of "lightning war" plays too large a part in German military doctrine, but there is every indication from the opinion of the man-in-the-street that we in Britain could do with the transmission of some lightning into British strategy at the present tme.

It took the Nazis precisely five weeks to sweep the British Army from the Continent and to subjugate France. The war in Russia has now been going on 22 weeks. We are living in an age when military decisions have to be carried out at airplane speed. Too much of our strategy is being carried out at stage coach speed. The Eight Point Agreement speaks of the need to help the Soviet Union by the supply of munitions and by the concerted action of the British and Soviet Armed Forces. This cannot be regarded as a policy for the distant future but for immediate application. It behoves each British Trade Unionist to see that it is fulfilled. It should become part of the trade union consciousness of every worker, moreover it must be applied concretely to each industry.

In the case of Mining there are special problems and difficulties to be overcome.

Attention has been directed to winter coal supplies; in this respect, whilst the efforts of the Miner have saved us from a coal crisis, the position still calls for the closest attention by those responsible for the Nation's coal needs.

Target production figures have been fixed on a National and District basis. Production Committees have been formed at the pits and are applying their experience and energy to the all-important question of greater production.

The request of the Mineworkers' Federation of Great Britain that the plan of the British Labour Movement for the socialisation of the coal industry should be implemented in order to end many of the present obstacles to production is to-day being considered by the British Trade Union and Labour Movements. The Miners are firmly convinced that one of the greatest contributions to greatly increased production would be the removal of the dead hand of Coal Capitalism from the paramount control of the industry.

In the meantime:—

Manpower—Safety—Supplies—Transport—Stocking facilities—each and every problem affecting production has come under review both Nationally and in the Districts.

How can we do something more to reinforce the Power of the Soviet Union in the struggle which is now raging to prevent the great industrial region of the Donetz Basin from falling into Nazi hands? The sending of a number of powerful bombers and fighting squadrons to-day must be a thousand times more important than the sending of many times that number in 3 or 6 months time. I bow to no one in my admiration of our splendid air force in its daily raids over Germany; I do not underestimate the long-term consequences of such raids, but at the present stage of the war I believe it is necessary to think in terms of speed. Now that the advance in Iran has opened up communications it is, in my opinion, more important that much of our Aircraft strength to-day used in raids over Germany should to-day be used in helping the Red Air Force to bomb the panzer divisions off the map in the Ukraine rather than bombing industrial objectives in Germany. I think the Government would be well advised to take into account the universal desire for the opening of a second land front which would divert German forces and thus relieve the terrific pressure being brought against the Soviet Union to-day. We do not want to see our army playing the same role as the ignominious Italian Army plays in relation to the Reichwehr.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I believe that the British Army, inspired by the proud fighting spirit of the British people, can play as glorious a role on land as our Navy and our Air Force are playing on the sea and in the air.

Speed is essential. There is too much complacent optimism. Time and Russian Weather are supposed to be on our side. We must wake up and rely upon our own strength rather than on cosmic forces.

We cannot, of course, have co-operation between the armed forces and at the same time be luke-warm to the policy of the closest possible co-operation between the organised Trade Union movement in both countries.

Everyone realises the importance of the approach we are now making to the Russian Unions. That approach does not commit the British Trade Unions to accept the policy of the Russian Trade Unions, but it does most emphatically commit us to a repudiation of any suggestion that the Russian Unions, or the system of which they are an integral part, have anything in common with Fascism.

Indeed, the agreement goes further, I believe it envisages the British and Soviet Trade Unions as a nucleus of a powerful and regenerated Trade Union Movement throughout the world.

That is, perhaps, one of the biggest gains that the entry of the Soviet Union into the war will bring. We cannot appreciate too clearly that in the interests of the workers of the world and of democracy and for the determined struggle against Fascism it is necessary to establish and maintain the closest unity of action with the workers of the U.S.S.R.

It will enable the working class in the two countries who are bearing the brunt of the struggle against Fascism to work hand in hand amid the din of battle towards the rebuilding of the international solidarity of the working class.

The realisation of this aim demands, first of all, the total defeat of Fascism, and for this we all must work. But if the workers are to be satisfied we must insist upon and secure equality of sacrifice and an equal obligation on the part of everyone to work as never before, to work in a manner which will be worthy of the sacrifice of our boys who risk their lives in battle. We are certain our boys will contribute glorious pages not only to military history but to the struggle of the liberation of mankind.

No time must be lost in increasing output, in getting rid of all obstacles to maximum production, no time must be lost in opening up the second front. The quicker we move the swifter and deadlier we plant our blows on the body of Fascism, the quicker the European peoples will rise to help us to shatter it for ever. Every worker to-day conscious of his great responsibility must work to ensure that our pledge of assistance to Russia will be our guide to action, our inspiration, our pledge that all British workers, individually and collectively, will work to bring a magnificent contribution to common *VICTORY*.

We have received the following letter: "On behalf of the members of the Battery I wish to thank you for your appeal for books for our library. We have received a splendid response. I only hope that the men will take full advantage of this splendid opportunity to educate themselves. Rest assured that my friends and I will assist in this."

RUSSIA'S STORY told in Pictures

Russia at work . . . Russia at play . . . Russia at war. Character studies of some of Russia's millions of workers, musicians, artists, writers. Pictures and biographies of Russia's leaders. Informative statistical diagrams. A book you will want to keep and show to your friends again and again.

52 PAGES

1/-

Obtainable from Central Books Ltd., 2, Parton Street, London, W.C.2.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia, America & Ourselves

The War Within America

by IVOR MONTAGU

IT is idle to suppose that any nation can remain "outside the war"—this war now—simply by preserving formal neutrality. Indeed, in a sense, the formal "international" war is but a tactical sector of the all-pervading battle of humanity against Fascism. Whether or not U.S.A. is yet technically *in* the "shooting war," this battle in the major sense is already in America.

Stalin foresaw this. As early as his speech of July 3rd he predicted that the war for existence of the Soviet peoples would become merged with the fight of the American and British peoples for democratic liberties. In November, Stalin was able to note that the resulting coalition "is growing and will continue to grow for the benefit of our common cause of liberation."

The growth of this triple coalition is the dominating factor determining the outcome of the war as the final defeat of Fascism. Hitler, in initiating his "crusade," had not only hopes of playing on the class contradictions in Britain, he counted still more on neutralising or even enlisting the United States.

The transformation of the world situation effected by June 22 certainly brought him results within the U.S.A. Yet these have not sufficed to halt the growth of collaboration, the practical rallying of the resources and people of the United States in solidarity with the Soviet Union. Within four months—from the initial statements of the Administration in July (corresponding to the Churchill declaration of June 22nd), the dispatch of Harry Hopkins to Moscow on confidential mission, the joint Churchill-Roosevelt "Aid-Russia" telegram to Stalin sent from the Atlantic meeting, the Three Power Conference in Moscow arranging further supplies of tanks and airplanes, the loan under the Lease-Lend Act of a thousand million dollars, and now U.S. airplanes in action on the Soviet front, while U.S. ships are now licensed to journey to Soviet ports equipped with arms to discourage would-be interruptors—much has been done.

This march toward Hitler's doom is not achieved without active resistance from his followers within U.S.A., without a spur to the frenzied ambition of promoters of Fascism within U.S.A., without a sharpening *domestically* of the universal conflict.

Hitler's aides within Britain have principally kept prudent rein on their tongues since June 22nd. Not so in U.S.A., where their loquacity reveals the hopes their master entertained.

(*Before*). "It's too bad all this talk of war between Germany and Russia seems to be nothing more than rumour so far." (Editorial in the *New York World Telegram*, June 20).

"But, boy, is this Russian business a break for us if news reports are true? Perhaps Hitler can take the wheatfields of the Ukraine. He needs them. Most military men believe he can grab the oil fields of what the old British Army called 'Mespot.' He needs them also. And so might control a self-contained inland empire. But, speaking entirely selfishly, is that so bad for us?" (General Johnson, in the Scripps-Howard Press, June 21).

(*After*). "Let us hope that Occidental peace can still be made and Europe united against the expansion of Asiatic Communism." (W. R. Hearst, June 30).

"... the Russian affair is quite different; that can last and pay dividends. With the Ukraine in German hands and German development applied to it, the rest of Russia does not matter." Hitler may go presently, and Schacht may return, then "with such a Germany a basis for reasoned negotiation would present itself. A highly attractive picture that stirs up the wishbone no end." (Thos. F. Woodlock, prominent Catholic, in the *Wall Street Journal*, June 30).

The wishbone stirred to some purpose. Spencer Williams, on the Columbia Broadcasting System, declared that the Soviet people were "waiting and praying for Hitler to deliver them." "It will take a miracle bigger than any seen since the Bible was written to save the Reds from utter defeat in a very short time. The Reds are on their way to a debacle not paralleled in history" (Fletcher Pratt in the *New York Press*). "In my judg-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment Hitler will be in control of Russia in 30 days" (Chief Red-Baiter, congressman Martin Dies, Chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, June 23rd).

The disappointment of these hyenas reoriented American politics. The masses mobilised for support of the Administration. C.I.O. and A.F.L. conventions went on record for "Aid to U.S.S.R."—the Transport workers, the Marine and Shipbuilding workers, the State and County Municipal workers (corresponding to British Civil Servants), the Mine Workers, the Electric, Radio and Machine workers, and hosts of others. But the mobilisation extended far beyond the ranks of labour. The famously conservative American Legion declared for "Aid to Russia." Catholic leaders breached the generally pro-Fascist Catholic "front" in America with assertions that "Hitler is the greatest enemy." A section of the Republican Party, with Willkie as spokesman, transformed its opposition to Roosevelt into pacemaking complaints that "the President does not go fast enough."

On the other hand, sections of big capital reacted according to pattern. The ultra-expansionist previous supporters of the President's foreign policy were bitterly chagrined. For them "aid Britain" was attractive while British capital stood alone, faced with the inescapable alternative, subordination to Hitler, or a resistance to Hitler dependent on U.S. aid for which the price was subordination to U.S.A. The fight of the Soviet Union made the difference. If Britain might be rescued, by expenditure of Soviet valour and sinews, *before* the stage of absolute dependence on U.S. aid, then "aid-Britain" was certainly a prospect far less pleasing. The pro-Hitlerites received reinforcements.

The American pro-Hitlerites — who are they? *Direct and blatant*—the "America First" group of capitalists. "I would a hundred times rather see my country ally herself . . . even with Germany, with all her faults." (Lindbergh in San Francisco, July 1st). Deprived by the new situation of any longer masquerading its pacifism in a guise seductive to the masses, its propaganda daily assumes a more directly Fascist character. From its platform, Lindbergh at Des Moines on September 11th, denounced "the Jews" for "hastening the U.S.A. to war out of hatred for Hitler." A series of investigations by John L. Spivak published in *New Masses* have revealed "America First" as a powerful body receiving millions of dollars for propaganda from a wealthy clique (principally the rivals to Morgan-Lamont), partly directly from Fascist sources.

"Nazis, Coughlinites and anti-Semites have taken over the organisation lock, stock and barrel. To-day America First is a tight little Nazi organisation that follows the party line as laid down in Berin. Some people of good intentions, but of little understanding, have been kept out in front as window-dressing. They are merely decoys." (Secretary of the Interior Ickes).

Next *the indirect*. The Republican ex-President Hoover and ex-Presidential candidate Landon, supported by the apostates from Rooseveltism, *New York Times* and Henry Luce's *Life* and *Time* group. Their line combines platonic love for Britain, an Ethel M. Dell "till-death-do-us-part" crush on the Finnish White Guards, mild chiding of Hitler, and every hindrance in the way of aid to U.S.S.R., the effective means of thwarting Hitler.

Finally, there is the confusion or apostasy of a section of American liberalism. J. T. Flynn, liberal, acts as New York head and front for "America First." The daughter of John Lewis, miners' leader, herself a C.I.O. official, serves on its "executive." Norman Thomas, perpetual "Socialist" candidate for President, lends it full support. In approving aid to U.S.S.R., the American Federation of Labour Executive Council snootily qualifies this with the remark that "even the *least* prospect of an alliance is unthinkable," since the Soviet organisation "does not conceal its enmity to democracy."

A view none the less formidable for its motley composition. Reinforced, as is the more circumspect mob in this country, by Fascist sympathisers dotted in stray points throughout the civil and military apparatus of the Administration. Such a fight as the Administration desires to wage, and is indeed actively and effectively maintaining, in the foreign field, can be maintained only by ruthless exposure of villainy and rescue of its dupes. Fascism can be fought only by an anti-Fascist fight. Dismissal of teachers, punitive sentences for "Communism," ceremonial burnings of subservive books, baiting of Negro recruits to the army, proceed without interruption. Earl Browder, Communist leader, is still held in gaol. A third investigating

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commission has now designated Harry Bridges, Australian-born Pacific Coast labour leader ("For us there has been no change. We don't back-track to anyone in fighting Fascism. We were the pioneers in this fight . . . ") for deportation, where two previous commissions had exonerated him.*

On this front, the domestic, the Administration hesitates. The copperheads raise their heads to strike. So far the Administration has not been defeated in Congress on a singe issue. But an attempt to send America's army trainees home, at this moment in history, after only one year's training, was defeated by only one vote! The House of Representatives majority that agreed revision of the Neutrality Act was only 18. La Guardia, supported by both Roosevelt and Willkie, was returned as Mayor of New York, in preference to a candidate supported by the "Bund," the "Christian Front" and "America First," by the smallest majority in the city's history. Danger signals.

No matter how much the Administration may seek to evade the issue (anti-Fascism) in the domestic field, there is one sector where the clash is inescapable, one sector where it is decisive—Production.

All is very much not well with production—the imperative basis for American foreign policy. Leon Henderson (Office of Production Administration and Civilian Supply Price Controller) declares that U.S.A. is giving 1 hour out of 8 for military production to-day, while Hitler is using 5 out of 8. He talks of big jumps scheduled, so that in 1942 "by January we ought to be up to 1½ hours out of every 8, by June up to at least 2 out of 8 for defence"! So far civil car production is reduced only by 25 per cent! Defence appropriations so far total 50 thousand million dollars, but contracts so far isued only 25 thousand million, production so far only 9. The July plane production figure was given as 1465—Roosevelt had estimated as necessary 50,000 per year.

In this situation the wealthy business interests turn round and blame the strikers—a slander that is commonly peddled across the Atlantic and fills the British Press.

What are the facts regarding the strike situation? As even the American Federation of Labour points out, the workers are confronted with a situation in which more production is being extracted from their labour, more profit extracted from their increased production, the cost of living is rising. Wage demands in such circumstances are inescapable.

The scale of profit-making continues fantastic. The *National City Bank bulletin* calculates in respect to 350 companies that, after deduction of all taxes, their profits show a rise for the first half of 1941 of 20 per cent. over the first half of 1940, 23 leading iron and steel companies show profits up 100 per cent., 27 machinery companies up 24.2 per cent., 9 motor car companies up 21.1 per cent. General Motors show 53,579,568 dollars profit for the second quarter of 1941 (compared with 46,546,999 for the first quarter) after payment of all taxes and salting away of 20 millions for contingency reserves. The railways (where employees are now demanding wage increases, and have made a strike vote to support them, larger than any in the history of the brotherhoods, and where no wage increase has been received since 1937) made 433,538,408 dollars profit in the first 6 months of 1941 (compared with 245,523,110 for the same period of 1940).

And price rises? Here are recent calculations: *Clothing* 20 per cent. *Meats* 15-30 per cent. *Woollen goods* (wholesale) 30 per cent. *Cotton goods* 35 per cent.—13 million surplus bales held in stock as a reserve. The American Federation of Labour conservatively estimates the rise since 1940 as 10 per cent. for food (25 per cent. for main foods), 13-17 per cent. for wholesale prices.

The Labour Research Association Economic Notes calculates a 49 per cent. rise in wholesale prices since August, 1939, and adds "a much steeper rise is indicated." Leon Henderson, Office of Production Administration and Civilian Supply Price Controller, acknowledges: "The price level has risen more than the labour rate level since this programme started," and more specifically estimates the price rise in twelve months of "basic commodities" as 17 per cent., of foodstuffs as 24 per cent., of rents as 20 to 30 per cent., with the higher incidence

* The verdict, by a Judge Sears, is awarded because the accused "has been a member of or affiliated with (*sic*) the Communist Party." Bridges denied ever having been a member, but the Judge held it proved since: "He has consistently favoured non-discrimination against Union men because of Communist membership and excoriated as Red baiters as he called them, those who took an opposite view."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the poorer and cheaper dwellings.

Yet the Department of Labour announced that the time lost by strikes had been 12 per cent. below the average for the past 5 years. The Under Secretary for War, Patterson, announced that on a defence building programme of 1½ thousand million dollars, including the building of 48 new factories and 50 new towns for employees in 300 days—a job of 62 million working days—less than .07 per cent. of time was lost through labour disputes.

Indeed, the American Federation of Labour journal *American Federationist* is able to quote official figures of industrial accidents (17,000 killed, 93,000 permanently disabled, 1½ million minor injuries resulting in loss of 200 million working hours, 25 million working days) demonstrating conclusively that elementary precautions against them taken by the employers would alone save more time than has been lost in all the strikes of the past year.

The main responsibility for the chaos and inadequacy of production rests squarely on the shoulders of the owners of the means of production, whom the Administration has left undisturbed in their empire over essential tools and materials. It rests on the absurd "dollar-a-year" self-control racket, of trusts by their own representatives, which has largely broken down already. The following is a list of the essential war materials now in short supply—aluminum, copper, tin, iron, steel, brass, nickel, rubber, silk, cork — virtually all essential war materials. During the last war, Eugene C. Grace, President of Bethlehem Steel, observed: "Patriotism is a beautiful thing but it must not be permitted to interfere with business." This is still the slogan of business. At the present time two companies only are manufacturing 4-motor bombers. They are turning out about 50 a month. Roosevelt said 500 a month was necessary. This, however, would require 40 million lbs. of aluminium, more than the entire U.S. output for 1940. In evidence during the summer the C.I.O. representatives urged the development of aluminium deposits in Arkansas, capable of producing 1,000 million lbs. per year. This the Mellon interests of Alcoa (Aluminium Company of America) opposed, refusing to expand production—as Secretary of the Interior Ickes testified before the Truman Senatorial Committee, in order to maintain the price of aluminium. Before the Committee Ickes declared: "When the story of this war comes to be written, if it has to be written that it was lost, it may be because of the recalcitrance of the Alcoa." Senator La Follette (May 19) declared: "Because of the monopoly practices of this corporation, because of its determination that there should be no competition, because of its policy of high prices and low production and no competition, additional unnecessary dislocations of our economy are present to-day in our defence programme." Now after months of delay and hard campaigning for it by the C.I.O., it has been agreed at last to open two aluminium production centres in Arkansas. One is to be assigned to control by Alcoa!

The tale could be expanded without end. Before a Senate Committee, Rear-Admiral Farley testified that manufacturers refused to fit guns for 28 destroyers, although offered the necessary tools, until the Vinson Act limiting their profit to 8 per cent. was repealed. Admiral Towers testified to an order for 300 guns being similarly refused because of a statutory reduction of the profit from 12 to 8 per cent.

Another feature is the continued restriction of orders to the few elect. According to the O.P.M. research bureau report, 6 firms (including General Motors, Dupont, and Morgan's Bethlehem Steel) had received 31.5 per cent. of all Army and Navy contracts to May. 56 firms had received 75 per cent. of such contracts. As the corresponding example, cite the National Small Business Man's Association report that while 73 per cent. of 94 small plants capable of fulfiling orders in Illinois applied for contracts, these were granted only to ⅓ of those appying.

A figure estimated variously at between 3 and 6 millions remain unemployed.

The secret of the present labour and production situation in the U.S.A. is—Provocation.* Labour's attitude is clear. John Murray, C.I.O. President, defined it in his report to the annual convention on November 17:

"The workers have been, are now, and always will be opposed to Hitlerism.

* How, in the light of the figures on price increases given above, can the Mediation Board offer of 7½ per cent. increase to the Railway Brotherhoods, who claimed 30 per cent., their wages having remained fixed since 1937, be understood as other than provocation ?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must be defeated and destroyed. Democracy can survive in no other way.

"Toward this end the Congress of Industrial Organisations offers its complete support to President Roosevelt's policy of furnishing through our Government all possible economic and material aid to Britain, the Soviet Union and China, which are nations now carrying on the struggle to rid the world of Nazism, the enemy of mankind."

But the workers, eager to increase production, are confronted by the employers, at the least indifferent to the peril constituted by Fascism, at the worst actively bent on sabotageing the defence effort, in any case busily engaged in raising prices in defiance of the President's pleas and ruthlessly determined upon extracting the last cent of profit and the last inch of concession from the workers. While in this situation both A.F.L. and C.I.O. leaders, Bridges among them, call for workers staying on the job during mediation and negotiation, there are others less concerned to avoid responding to the provocation.

"When John L. Lewis ordered the miners to stop work, he did not act in their best interests, or in the interests of the whole labour movement . . . John L. Lewis introduced confusion and delay by resorting to strike before fully exhausting all possibilities for a peaceful settlement . . . Lewis, who has aligned himself with Hoover, Landon and Lindbergh, who has given comfort to the appeasers and the "America First" friends of Hitlerism, has now played into the hands of those reactionaries who would provoke labour into rash action and who would use such actions as an excuse to attack all labour." (*New Masses*, November 4th, 1941).

The employers seek to confront Roosevelt with the dilemma of the French People's Front. As Murray said in the speech above-quoted, the defence agencies are "serious failures," "the whole picture of the defence programme has become one of chaotic administrative disorder," and labour, from which the sacrifices are demanded, is given little voice in its organisation, while the defence agencies remain dominated by the company executives who are anxious to rob or sabotage or both. The employer-provocateurs seek to force Roosevelt to acquiesce in this position of pillage, isolate him as a "Red" if he moves against them, and oblige him to accept anti-strike legislation that, by ham-stringing his own supporters, will deliver him into their hands to be later repudiated and cast away.

In this situation, the rôle for labour is to cut all knots by itself taking the lead in the defence programme, and enlisting nation-wide support for *this* offensive. This is exactly what it is doing, against all obstacles. Murray, C.I.O. President, put forward a plan of industrial councils to mobilise the entire national apparatus for defence; shelved. The aluminium workers put forward a plan to stretch that bottleneck; the United Automobile Workers, to substitute tanks and planes for private cars, the Steel Workers Organising Committee, to step up steel production; turned down. George Addes, secretary of the A.U.A.W., at a C.I.O. conference on "Priorities' Unemployment," reported that only 35 per cent. capacity was being used in automatic machine tool and die production (in 34 plants 337 of 1,577 machines were not in use at all); he put forward a plan for use of full capacity; ignored. The S.W.O.C. wrote the Vice-President of Curtiss-Wright that 24 per cent of propellors produced at the company's two plants in Pittsburgh—a scrap total of 400—500 a week—were being scrapped owing to "inefficiencies and mismanagement that the Union can assist in correcting." Nothing done.

But none the less, something is being done. The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers' Union (C.I.O.) is organising conferences on an Emergency Programme against lay-offs. 1,500 delegates, including C.I.O. and A.F.L. managements, mayors and other representatives of more than 500 communities in 11 mid-west states, took part. By U.E. initiative, functioning "Defence Committees" of local mayors, employers and workers' representatives have been set up in New Jersey, Brooklyn, Indianapolis, and Dayton, Ohio. Headway, even against the Press, that big business can mobilise, is being made in public opinion to such an extent that Willkie ("determined-to-be-President") has sensed it popular to come out for "participation of real representatives of labour," and not anti-strike legislation, as the cure for the production chaos. The counter offensive against Fascism sweeps forward, within as well as without. Fascist obstruction and provocation will be overcome. America will do its share.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Joint Production Committees

by LEN POWELL

(Secretary, Engineering and Allied Trades Shop Stewards National Council)

"FORMATION of Joint Production Committees in every factory with the fullest facilities for the Shop Stewards taking full part and accepting joint responsibility for seeing plans are discussed with all the workers and then carried out." *

This was one of the practical proposals accepted at the National Production Conference convened by the Engineering and Allied Trades Shop Stewards National Council on October 19th last, and held in the Stoll Theatre, London.

The idea of Joint Production Committees had arisen some two or three months prior to the National Conference and had originally been discussed at the various district Engineering Shop Stewards' Conferences up and down the country. A more positive approach to the extremely bad position of production in the factories had become urgently necessary. The previous 18 months had seen numberless deputations of infuriated shop stewards, with shocking reports of managerial and ministerial inefficiencies prevalent in their factories, waiting upon Lord Beaverbrook, Ernest Bevin, and Members of Parliament. Whilst these and other Ministers often went to the factories and even held enquiries, practically nothing at all was done to better armament production. This lesson was learnt by the workers and new methods grew up.†

Engineering workers recognise that their Shop Stewards, whom they elect, are extremely well equipped to grapple with the impediments to maximum production prevalent in the armaments industry. Their skill as workmen and the experience gained by them in carrying out the duties of stewards, i.e., negotiating with the managements on proper piece-work prices and timing of operations, wages, welfare, dilution, indeed all issues affecting workshop and workpeople's conditions, mean that they can make a real contribution on behalf of the workers towards increased production.

Shop Stewards, representing the point of view of their members, together with charge hands and foremen meeting regularly with the managements, can bring forward the best and quickest methods for doing jobs, which means that where managements are capable and responsive, much more production results. On the reverse side of the picture, the propositions made and acted upon by the men on the job will make it possible to save production hours and turn out a better job than can be planned by the so-called "practical experts" who in many factories to-day are there often because of whom they know instead of what they know.

Let me give some examples of the results of applying the policy of Joint Production Committees, which I will place under three categories, i.e. (1) Successful and showing increases in production; (2) Committees set up but really only on paper as the management refuses to do anything to make them successful; (3) Complete opposition on the part of the management to the workers having a say in production.

CATEGORY 1.
LONDON ENGINEERING FIRM

"Works are open for minimum of 57½ hours per week, no week-end work, men have agreed to discipline themselves to a minimum of 55 hours per week. Men have also agreed to voluntarily cut the dinner-time clocking-in grace by 2 mins., also to cut time allowed for washing from 5 mins. to 3 mins. We have an agreement whereby we elect our own charge-hand; this step alone has made for better flow of work through shop. . . . . Every co-operation with management—we have monthly production meetings. . . . Our aim is to double output by November. Pro-

* "Arms and the Men" p. 6. (Published by the Shop Stewards National Council. 2d.)

† In some instances Joint Production Committees were already an accomplished fact, and consequently a number of delegates were able to enrich the discussion at the Stoll Theatre with varying experiences of these Committees.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duction now up 30 per cent. but only just started.

Methods employed to get more production —plenty of propaganda and dinner time talks on the need for more production, though this would be easier if our lads were fighting more.* Monthly shop meetings to discuss production and debate suggestions from men and managements for further improvements."

S.E. ENGLAND AIRCRAFT

"At a recent interview with the management on production it was agreed that Harry Pollitt should be invited to address a meeting on production in the Canteen. The workers are determined that they are going all out for production and nothing is going to stand in their way. A minimum of 3 nights per week overtime and Saturday afternoon has been agreed on by several departments. Disciplinary action to be taken against any worker if men in department ask for action. Letters are in the hands of the members of works committee guaranteeing all prices. These letters have been signed by the works manager and copies given to all Shop Stewards.

Below is a copy of a statement signed by a departmental foreman:—

'This is to state I am very pleased with the increase in production in my department since the production drive by the workpeople.

'Overtime is being worked by the men and jobs are being done nearly twice as quick. One job which originally took 109 hours to do is now being done in 47 hours by the same labour.

'Workers, Shop Stewards, Charge hands and myself are now driving for a total war effort."

SHEFFIELD STEEL WORKS

"Our Works Committee also decided to initiate a drive through the entire works for an increase of 25 per cent. in production. The management have agreed to give the fullest co-operation, prices are guaranteed, machinery for uprooting inefficiency, mismanagement and bottlenecks has been agreed upon, and during this week we Stewards hope to carry out a series of meetings in every shop and to get things going."

N.W. ENGLAND

"A Production Committee has already met twice with the management and is functioning very well. Questions dealing with absenteeism and managerial problems including the appointment of foremen are being tackled in a co-operative way between the Shop Stewards and the management.

In one particular instance a worker introduced small gadgets into a job in order to speed it up. The rate fixer came round and took a bad attitude towards the worker and proposed cutting the time. The Shop Stewards were quickly on the job, held a meeting and the rate fixer was severely reprimanded by the management.

It is now being proposed that a standing Production Committee (two or three) be set up by the Shop Stewards to regularly discuss production in the factory. This has the tentative agreement of the manager.

There have been marked improvements in production in some of the departments. Craft problems stand in the way and call for careful handling. Men have been known to side-step teaching girls or giving them the proper training. But these difficulties are now being sifted down to individuals. Other problems such as wage demands, bonus, etc., are being handled and disputes that normally would have taken place have been avoided."

S.W. LONDON INSTRUMENT WORKS

"We have now in operation a Production Advisory Committee (3 Shop Stewards, 3 Foremen, Works Manager) meeting fortnightly or in emergency. In conjunction with above we have Shop Committees in 4 out of 5 departments, which are responsible for preliminary examination of any complaints or suggestions. The latter are taken up with the foreman and failing satisfaction put before the Production Committee.

We have an efficient and reasonable management, but several unsuitable foremen. The main obstacles unfortunately lie on our side, due to apathy and anarchistic attitude of a number of employees. We are, however, making some progress with these people.

As far as results go, the management informs us that there is a definite improvement in output during the past three months, but we have no figures to offer."

HERTFORDSHIRE AIRCRAFT

"Relationship with Management: Since the attack upon the Soviet Union and the signing of the Anglo-Soviet Pact, a complete change has taken place. Stewards have been given greater scope, and the management, after being approached, offered to meet six stewards regularly to discuss production.

We have undoubtedly achieved things which, while not yet showing results, are bound to have a very great effect upon production when it gets under way. On the last day of October an interesting statement was broadcast by the Management." *

---

* *I.e.*, if more military assistance were being given to the U.S.S.R.

Statement by the Management (31.10.41)

* "Since the German invasion of Russia, the stubbornness of the defence and the bravery of the Russian soldier have caught the attention of the world, and, cutting across all political differences and prejudices, have created a common front between the British and the Russian peoples in their fight against tyranny.

The Management, in common with every individual in the Company, is willing to support any efforts which can give real and practical help to the common cause.

The Shop Stewards have put forward a suggestion, and wish to discuss this with

(*Footnote continued at foot of next page*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GLASGOW SHIPYARD

"Following approach a joint statement was issued by Management and Shop Stewards and posted up in yards and shops urging increased output and efficiency for joint British-Soviet defeat of Fascism. Shop Stewards agreed to petition Government calling for no Income Tax on overtime earnings.

Management agreed to idea of monthly meetings and suggested National speakers may be invited to speak. Management asked Shop Stewards to try and reduce time lost by men in arriving on ships late and leaving off early to get near the gate for stopping time. This raises question of transport which is mainly the cause. . . .

One hold up arising frequently is due to Admiralty inspectors coming on to ships at too late a stage in their completion, thus causing large alterations which could be rectified at an earlier stage if the process of inspection was made earlier. Management agreed to take this up."

These seven examples, taken from every part of the country, show what can be done, given goodwill on the part of the management. Later, I suggest the further steps for maximum production that can be taken in cases like these. But there are other cases, which I put in Category 2, where in one way or another, either because the management is acting under compulsion ("A man convinced against his will is of his own opinion still"—and the same is true for a management as a man) or because they are not interested in production, or for some other reason, the setting up or functioning of Joint Production Committees is frustrated.

CATEGORY 2

WEST OF DONDON FACTORY

"Constant battle with management. We offered to co-operate in the interests of production. Owing to our strength, management agree to our suggestions, but only when forced do they put them into operation. Constant attempts to avoid written agreements.

All productive efforts by management meet full co-operation from Shop Stewards. Production publicity intensified in last three months. Any disputes immediately taken up by Stewards to avoid loss of time. Rate-fixing committee of Shop Stewards who investigate any rate disputes and avoid hold-ups. Any hold-ups through waiting for components, castings, etc., immediately investigated and altered if possible.

Fortnightly meetings between management and negotiating committee forestall trouble. Production committee of stewards, bringing to light many snags which are gradually being obliterated. Production meetings occasionally, constant endeavours by stewards to impress workers with their responsibility. Weekly meeting of Shop Stewards committee—outstanding items taken up with management by negotiating committee. Local production rally being organised.

Through machinery being incorrectly proportioned, e.g., lathes turning out more components than drills can handle—another drill brought into factory after representations were made.

Management informs Production Committee that clerical staff cannot take on extra work to get extra production, that we shall be producing 30 per cent. more by next March: that they sympathise with our desire but that it is a national question. We are endeavouring to call a meeting of the firm's Combine Shop Stewards on the question of production."

LONDON AIRCRAFT

"The management agreed after some pressing to the setting up of a kind of joint production committee.

No apparent drive on the part of management for production gives the workers a sense of frustration and apathy."

NORTH LONDON AIRCRAFT

"The management's final decision was that we workers could set up our own production committee which would be met by a member of the management who would discuss these points with us, but as to a joint committee it cannot be the workers who can solve all the problems, it must be left to the management to decide what is to be done.

The workers feel that, although we have not got a joint production committee, yet if we utilise what we have to its fullest extent in increasing production to help the Soviet workers to smash Fascism, a joint production committee will come automatically."

Thirdly, there still exist, unfortunately in no small number, factories and firms in which there seems to be as yet no real understanding of what is at stake, of the new methods that must be employed or of the need to welcome every example of initiative displayed by representatives of the workers. Here I give seven examples from the reports sent in to us or made at the Production Conference of 19th October.

CATEGORY 3

MIDLANDS AIRCRAFT

"General expression of feeling that negotiations with present management not possible. Workers in angry mood asserted promise of redress of many grievances made

---

(Continuation of footnote from previous page). their fellow workers in the Canteen on Friday, November 7th, at 5.35 p.m. The Management, on this occasion, has given permission for the meeting to be held.

On its part the Management proposes to make a special drive during the month of November to overcome any obstacles which may prevent the full employment of our total man-power."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over and over again but not kept.

Resolution proposed: *'That this mass meeting of No. 2 workers are dissatisfied with conditions of employment and state of production in this factory over past 12 months and demand the Management be removed.'* To be sent to the Ministry of Labour. Adopted unanimously."

A LONDON FACTORY

"Men engaged on piece work are not allowed to do more than a certain number of articles each day. The factory is frequently closed down mid-day Saturday when there is plenty of work to be done. . . . Any suggestions made by us to the management are immediately turned down."

MERSEYSIDE

"Any attempt to start a campaign for increased production was prevented by the management refusing to call meetings of the Yard Committee to discuss same.

SURREY AIRCRAFT

The works manager is in agreement with the works committee upon the questions of production and agrees that workers' representatives be on production committees, but says he is not in a position to grant same as these matters rest with the directors of the company. He has informed the directors of our wishes, but we have not yet received a reply. . . . . Yes, there is no doubt that since we have organised a works committee production has definitely increased."

YORKSHIRE

"The management do not encourage the stewards to co-operate in any way to help production, but recognise them as a negotiating body for general working conditions as the men are 100 per cent. A.E.U. here.

It is difficult to estimate the percentage increase in production, but undoubtedly as the result of continual approaches to the management, a number of idle machines have been brought into production, and a double shift put on all components during the last two months. However, the output of this factory is considerably below the full capacity possible."

LONDON OPTICAL WORKS

"We also demand close co-operation between the workers and the management but are ever met in reply with the answer that our aims would only result in interference with Managerial Functions.

We are greatly concerned at the existent lethargy, both by the management and many workers in the great effort that is necessary."

N. LONDON

"The management has tried to use our drive for production and for co-operation as a time to attack the Stewards movement and weaken organisation, but they have only succeeded in strengthening it and provoking hostility."

The varying stages shown by the above examples are understandable but have to be seriously faced up to. Whilst a few weeks back the National Engineering Employers Association objected to its members giving assistance to A.E.U. Shop Stewards in compiling an official Union questionnaire covering production questions, quite recently that body has taken a step in the national interest and has sent a circular * to its constituents suggesting that no obstacle should be put in the way of Joint Production Committees where such are requested by the Shop Stewards for the purpose of increasing production. This tardy, but nevertheless welcome, action on the part of the Association should materially assist the workers falling in categories 2 and 3.

Where managements continue to obstruct, the Shop Stewards Committees in such factories and shipyards should report the matter to the respective Trade Union District Committees and through these bodies get the Regional Boards of the Production Executive to act. Federated firms can be reported to their Associations on the basis of the circular mentioned above.

The Regional Boards, upon which are Trade Union officials, in my opinion could be made to function much better. But they could do a real job of work if provided with concrete cases; and indeed they should be utilised also in checking up weaknesses and generally in developing production in industrial areas. This can be done if the stewards keep close contact with, and supply information to the Union's District Committees.†

Whilst the examples quoted in the first category show that the shop stewards movement is getting into its stride and obtaining results that will play a tremendous part in the fight against Hitler alongside our Soviet comrades, all will agree that still more remains to be done. I believe that a systematic checking up should be made: that the shop stewards should ask the managements periodically such questions as the following:—

1. By what percentage has production increased over the last period?

* The circular is printed as an appendix to this article.

† The A.E.U. Birmingham District Committee raised the question of absence of Joint Production Committees in the area with the Midland Regional Board. This body circularised the employers advising them to set up Production Committees with representatives of their workpeople!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. What is the increase attributable to? Is it due to
   (a) Increased piece-work earnings and a greater effort by the workers?
   (b) Replanning of jobs and or machinery or other similar suggestions from the workers?
   (c) Better workshop conditions (light, heat, ventilation, canteen, etc.)?
   (d) More effective training of the newcomers into the industry?
   (e) Elimination of late-coming and absenteeism (by better transport, shop stewards' efforts, etc)?
   (f) Additional overtime and/or nightshift, three shift working, etc.?
   (g) Better earnings, nurseries, welfare, etc., for the women workers?

There are of course other reasons that can be enumerated—based upon the decisions of the National Production Conference and detailed in the report "Arms and the Men" under the heading "Memorandum Summary for Select Committee on National Expenditure," but information such as the above, at the disposal of the Shop Stewards and Trade Union movement, would be invaluable in taking the campaign further forward and in assisting those workers who are not so favourably placed at the moment. In addition, a picture must be drawn that must indelibly imprint itself upon the mind—namely, the proof of the capability of the British working-class not only to rise to the occasion, but to be capable of those things always considered to be the prerogative of the employing class, capabilities that have been and are being so ably demonstrated by our Soviet brothers.

It should be particularly noted that the activities of the movement, and the concrete proposals which came out of the National Production Conference have put the Shop Stewards on the map, and succeeded in giving a lead to the nation. It has changed the original approach of the authorities and the Press to insufficient production which was summed up as being the fault of the workers, together with great play made on absenteeism and the blessings (to the management) of the Essential Works Order.

An additional result is that in unorganised and poorly organised factories the increased production issue has become the incentive for better Trade Union organisation in such enterprises.

Since the National Conference the campaign for increased production has forged ahead. New forces are participating, holding mass meetings, becoming politically convinced, and giving the practical proposals to their shop stewards to take to the managements. Foremen and charge hands are consulted and present at the joint production conferences, and a good, and necessary, feature is the collaboration of the men, women and youth operatives with the draughtsmen, scientific workers, and the clerks. Pleas of managements that they are unable to move due to holdups in one or more of their dispersal factories are met with and being overcome by the shop stewards of the parent concern linking up the more strongly with their dispersed brothers. Similarly with sub-contracting and sub-sub-contracting. Bottlenecks are being investigated by the stewards of the main firm making the necessary contact and investigation. Thus all impediments can be grappled with, from insufficient earnings, to the problem of who should be released for the Army, and who is vitally necessary to be retained for training newcomers to a new lay-out of the machines.

I must emphasise here that insufficient earnings are really a great impediment, and call for more attention than a Joint Production Committee can give to this question. Whilst it is possible eventually to remove some anomalies in individual factories by levelling up rates, readjusting piece work prices, pool bonus or special output bonuses for the time workers, the current wage increase requests* of the engineering Unions, necessitates maximum publicity and propaganda to bring before the British people the real position and by making the facts clear to influence the National Arbitration Tribunal. Shop stewards should give full support to the publicity campaign decided upon by the Unions. Amongst the workers in war industry affected by insufficient earnings, shipyard workers are particularly hard hit, and delegates to our National Conference stressed the fact that only the Essential Work Order was keeping the men in the yards as they are taking as much as £1 per week less than opera-

* A.E.U. and N.U.P.W. 4d. per hour increase; Confederation (other Unions) 10/- per week increase.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives employed in other sections of the industry! Again, nobody, least of all the women, believes that the recent 5/- and 3/- increases on women's rates is going to be an incentive to attract them to the industry, and make them feel happy about putting their backs into it.

Obviously, where at the moment Joint Production Committees are not in being due to obstruction, this should not be used as an alibi for doing nothing. Personal examples of good timekeeping and collective efforts for greater output can be achieved, with mass-meetings to get a clear understanding amongst the workers as a necessary pre-requisite. This is the way to overcome absenteeism which (the fact must be faced) is still a serious obstacle in certain big shipyards and factories.

A classic example of working class resolve and initiative has been shown by the stewards and workers at a large N. London Aircraft works. The management refused to co-operate, so the workers set up their own production committee. One worker designed a jig which did away with twenty-two other jigs. The spirit of these workers was aptly expressed by one of their stewards, namely, that whether the management liked it or not, production was going to be increased in that factory, and if the management continues to stand in the way, then it will be swept aside.

That must be the spirit of all workers in this dire hour. The maximum possible unity and co-operation to defeat Hitler, but all who dare obstruct, whether in the factory or elsewhere, must be removed.

APPENDIX

Copy of Circular issued to Federated Employers in Engineering.

You are aware that a good deal of publicity has recently been given to the view that there should be closer consultation between management and the workpeople on production problems.

The matter has been discussed by the Engineering Industry Panel of the Ministry of Labour, from the point of view of encouraging Works Committees. Recommendations along these lines have also been made by the Select Committee on Expenditure of the House of Commons. There have been cases where production has been held up through shortage of material or changing design, waiting for tools, etc., etc., and it has been suggested that the workpeople have been insufficiently informed as to the reasons for such interruption of production, with the result that complaints have been made to Government Departments and to the public.

It is now clear that there is considerable movement in the country amongst Shop Stewards who, in view of the Russian situation, are expressing great willingness to help to achieve full production and to co-operate with the management.

The Federation have taken the line that the creation of Works Committees in terms of our Shop Stewards and Works Committees Agreements, or the formation of Works Councils or consultative bodies on a more elastic basis, is a matter for the two sides in an individual firm on the basis of mutuality and not compulsion.

The Federation have no objection to the formation of such bodies and indeed are prepared to encourage them where this mutual desire is evident. We are aware that in the Federation there are already many hundreds of Works Committees and Works Councils of one kind or another.

We have received numbers of communications from members who have been approached by their Shop Stewards on these general lines. Our view is that Federated Employers should not refuse such offers of assistance, but should endeavour to establish such organised contact as will create a better understanding of the problems of the factory and let the workpeople feel that their goodwill is welcome.

Such bodies would not, of course, discuss wages and working conditions, the subject of agreements or recognised practices, dealt with in terms of the Provisions for Avoiding Disputes. The ordinary procedure would continue to apply in such matters. It is important that this position should be safeguarded. In addition it is equally important that in any action taken nothing is done to encourage the setting up of ad hoc unofficial movements which might operate against the agreed procedure between the Federation and the Trade Unions.

Index to 1941.

THE INDEX TO VOLUME XXIII for the year 1941 of the LABOUR MONTHLY, divided according to authors and subjects, is now ready.
The index will be sent to individual readers on receipt at the LABOUR MONTHLY office of a stamped (2½d.) addressed foolscap envelope.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How "Leftism" Helps Hitler

by J. R. CAMPBELL

WAR to-day moves with the speed of a Hawker Hurricane and not with that of Sir Douglas Haig's heavily laden infantryman floundering in the mud of Flanders. Within three weeks of the opening of the attack in the West in 1940, the British Army was evacuated from Dunkirk and within five weeks the bulk of the great French Army was being corralled into Nazi concentration camps. A fortnight's offensive last spring wiped out the British gains in Libya. In all our thinking about the new phase of the war, we must never forget the factor of speed.

Even against the background of Germany's previous series of lightning victories, how magnificent is the resistance of the Soviet Union. In the spring of 1940 the British and French armies were defeated by a Nazi Germany which was operating on the basis of its own resources. To-day the Soviet Union is facing a Nazi Germany which has organised all the vast industrial resources of Europe for war, which has mobilised the man power of the conquered countries to work in Germany so as to enable more German man power to be mobilised for the army, which has on its side the armies of Finland, Roumania, Hungary, Slovakia and several Italian Army Corps, a combined force which must be as great as that of the entire mobilised British Army. In the Far East it has the assistance of the Japanese Army in immobilising large Soviet forces. Who in face of these facts can doubt that in the Soviet Union all the conquered peoples of Europe, all the anti-Fascist forces of the world have found a mighty ally.

The class conscious workers of the world can never afford for a single moment to forget what the Soviet Union represents. The October Revolution was a mighty leap forward for all progressive humanity. In the last quarter of a century the validity of Socialism has been tested over one-sixth of the world. That a planned Socialist economy can end unemployment, can raise the agricultural population to a high level of culture and well-being, can unite the most diverse nations in a common Socialist brotherhood, has been proved beyond all doubt. This is not a victory for the Soviet people alone. It represents the furthest point of advance achieved by humanity in its struggle for emancipation. The defence of the Soviet Union is thus the defence of the whole future of the human race.

Those who have studied modern war understand the importance of holding certain decisive key points. If one of those key points is taken, the defence of a whole system of subsidiary positions becomes hopeless. The Soviet Union is such a key point in the struggle for a higher order of society. Were it to fall, many of the positions held by the common people of other lands could not continue to be held. There are certain so-called Socialists who doubt this, who pretend to be able to envisage a bright prospect for humanity even if the Soviet Union were defeated or decisively weakened. Such an example of Hitlerism with a red tie on is seen in a recent pronouncement by a well known I.L.P. leader.

"Whatever happens on the battlefields now, the future of Russia will depend on how far Britain and Europe will be Socialist at the end of the war. A capitalist Britain and a capitalist Europe will not help Russia to maintain her economic basis and to develop to full Socialism." (Fenner Brockway's Election Address).

According to this despicable nonsense, the future of Europe is not being decided on the battlefields now. The Red Army can be driven back and Soviet Russia weakened, but the oppressed peoples of Europe will in some unexplained fashion rise against Hitler and establish Socialism, while in Britain, despite any victories which the Nazi Army may achieve, a government of I.L.P. conscientious objectors will seize power and defy Hitler. The aim of this contemptible fantasy is clear. It is to prevent the workers from doing all in their power now to help the Socialist Union.

Bearing in mind the great issues at stake and the importance of speed, there was only one possible policy for responsible Socialists after the Soviet Union was attacked, and that was to fight for the speediest all-round co-operation with the Soviet Union in all spheres on the basis of the most complete unity of all those who, for whatever reason, are out for the decisive defeat of Nazi Ger-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many. Anyone who, seeing the strength of Nazi Germany as manifested in action during the last two years, does not understand that its defeat depends on the mobilisation of every possible anti-Hitler Force is dead to all understanding of the present situation.

On June 22nd Great Britain found itself at war with the same enemy as the Soviet Union. The obvious first step for all serious Socialists was to fight for the development of a real alliance, involving the closest military and economic co-operation between the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States of America. The alliance had to be formed at once and on the basis of the real political forces existing in Britain and America. A sheer lack of common-sense is betrayed by those who run around mouthing the commonplace that a Socialist government or a people's government would be a more reliable ally for the Soviet Union than the present coalition. A strong, well-established Socialist government could only have arisen on the basis of an entirely different development of the political struggle in the last decade than what actually took place. All the pre-requisites for such a government are lacking at the present time, and to come out in a drive for such a government is to neglect the essential task of mobilising the British people to fight with all their strength alongside the Soviet Union. This is playing Hitler's game. As Stalin pointed out in his Anniversary speech, Hitler hoped to rally the nations of the world for a struggle against Bolshevism. If that could not be achieved in all lands he hoped to create a split between those who approve of the economic and political system of the Soviet Union and those who do not, leading to internal paralysis in Britain and U.S.A. which would prevent these countries being able to co-operate effectively with the Soviet Union. It is obvious that this policy requires to be countered by a policy which aims at uniting all those in Britain and America who, for whatever reason, are prepared to work for the defeat of Nazi Germany. And however unpalatable it may be for Utopians, one cannot at the present stage of political development in this country have a strong government with the British people behind it, without the Conservative, Liberal and Labour parties being dominant in it. This does not mean that we must register full approval of everything that this government does or fails to do. Nor does it mean that we approve of its existing personnel. We have to take into account the pro-Nazi tendencies of certain powerful groups of Conservatives. But when all is said and done you cannot have a strong representative government in Britain, capable of carrying the people with it, without the parties in the present coalition. The basic task for all sensible Socialists therefore is to mobilise the British people in a great popular movement for solidarity with the Soviet Union that will ensure that the government fulfils its obligations with the utmost possible speed.

The oft posed question of whether the British imperialists are really concerned with helping the Soviet Union is surely based on a very superficial examination of the situation. Before the entry of the Soviet Union into the war, the position of the British imperialists was a truly desperate one. If the Red Army were to be eliminated from this struggle, vastly superior Nazi forces would advance to engage the British Army in Egypt or at the gates of India itself. To support the Soviet Union is therefore for the more far-sighted imperialists an elementary act of self-preservation. The issue as Churchill sees it, is the preservation of the British Empire and to achieve that he is prepared to assist in the preservation of the Soviet Union. Of course there are other trends. There are those who would like to stand back and watch the Germans and the Russians exhaust each other. There are those who would just assist the Soviet Union sufficiently to keep it in the war, and there are those who understand that to take up such a negative attitude is to imperil not only the Soviet Union but the British people as well. It would be well if some Socialist workers would occasionally see the British people as well as the British imperialists. More and more British people are coming to realise that the fullest co-operation with the Soviet Union is essential if they are to survive. For it is now clear that a victory which would leave Hitler undisputed master of Europe, would enable him to build up such power that it would not merely be a question of the British State losing this or that Imperial possession, but of the British people losing their political independence and being brought face to face with physical extermination. The strengthening of the solidarity campaigns in all their varied forms is an essential feature in the drive to strengthen that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendency amongst the ruling class that is for the most complete co-operation with the Soviet Union.

We need not only a policy which unites the British people, but one which ensures the growing support of the U.S.A., which is decisive for the defeat of Hitler. The British Government is in a measure a link between the Soviet Government and the Government of the U.S.A., and only a Government based on the existing great political groupings in Britain, but strengthened with regard to personnel and policy can play that role.

All this moves some grouplets of "Left" Socialists, not to speak of Trotskyist Hess men, to gibbering rage. "The Communists are abandoning the class struggle," they scream. This from people who have never led a serious struggle of any kind would be amazing if it did not infect honest workers who have that healthy suspicion of the ruling class which is the beginning of political wisdom—but not the end. The existence of the Soviet Union is the highest achievement of the class struggle on a world scale, and to defend it by all means, to procure for it all aid, military and economic, and to make such alliances as will lead to this result is the only way of conducting the class struggle at this moment.

The very existence of the Soviet Union as an alternative system of society, has for a quarter of a century acted as a measure of restraint on the capitalists in democratic countries when they were contemplating attacks on their own workers. In defending their own land, in struggling to prevent the consolidation of a Fascist Europe, the Red Army is doing more to defend the conditions of the workers in Britain than all the workshop struggles that ever were or will be waged. To treat the question of support for the Red Army as being of small account is therefore to disrupt the class struggle in its most vital centre.

Yet that is what certain "Left" Socialists are doing. In an I.L.P. organ the following statement can be read:

"The greatest danger is that concentration on a demand for military action in the West will divert attention from the paramount necessity of replacing the Churchill Government by a Socialist Government."

Black treachery could go no further. For consider the position. The great Socialist State is invaded. Millions of Socialists are locked in battle with the Nazi forces, and instead of concentrating on the demand that the British Government implement its alliance to the full by rendering prompt military aid, the British workers are asked to turn their eyes away from the battlefields on which the destiny of mankind is being decided, and support a handful of conscientious objectors in a campaign for a pure Socialist government. This is not conducting the class struggle, but abandoning it most shamefully. It is prostituting the word "socialism" as much as it has ever been prostituted by a Hitler or a Goebbels. When at the I.L.P. Summer School, Captain Liddell Hart argued against the creation of a Western Front, an I.L.P. publication noted that "J. Maxton said that Captain Liddell Hart was very near the I.L.P. point of view except that we did not want any fighting at all." Think of it! Daily the Red Army men are dying, daily the Socialists in occupied Europe, inspired by its example, are risking their lives, and these "Socialists" come forward and say "don't demand a Second Front, let's have some propaganda for a Socialist government led by men who do not want to fight at all." And these men have the audacity to talk about class struggle.

But perhaps the men who do not want to fight at all at least favour the sending of arms to the Soviet Union to help it in its fight. By no means. In another "Left" publication there is an account of a Shop Stewards Conference on Merseyside where a delegate declared that workers ought to give "an hour's work for every one hour spent in the factory." The readers of this publication are told that this means stopping the class struggle. Think of it. Every day tanks and planes are being landed at Soviet ports. Maybe the main intention of those who sent them is quite unconnected with any desire to help the cause of Socialism, but the tanks and planes help it, nevertheless. Yet so-called Socialists shout "betrayal" when a speaker at a Shop Stewards Conference suggests that workers engaged in producing tanks and planes should not idle their time away. The label on this particular propaganda packet may read "class struggle." Its real content is sabotage of the defence of the first Socialist state.

This "Left" claptrap would not be dangerous if it was not able to fuse

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with tendencies of a quite different origin, providing them with a species of moral justification. It is notorious that in certain workshops the "Lefts" are seeking an alliance with the most conservative sections of the trade union movement on the basis of opposition to any attempt to increase production. One can understand why the craftsmen in certain districts (who sacrificed a great deal in the last war, only to find the employers and government forgetting what they had promised as soon as the war is over) being chary about the introduction of women and trainees into industry, and should look askance at suggestions for increasing production. Their attitude is the result of bitter experience. But experience is not a guide unless it enables us to see what is new in a given situation. The experienced man, who tries to explain an entirely new situation in terms of some past situation with which he was familiar, may be an organiser of disaster—as the experienced Maginot Generals were in France. To uphold trade union customs which are restrictive of production, and by so doing deprive the State of munitions to wage battle against a power that aims to destroy all trade unionism is surely to take a topsy-turvy view of events. It is putting a petty corporate custom (very often of no real value as far as being a bulwark of present-day working class conditions is concerned) against the most urgent and vital interests of all working humanity. "Left" Socialism seeks to nourish this ignorant, conservative spirit and seek to give it a Socialist justification.

Sometimes it plays upon the conservative trade unionists ingrained respect for the "powers that be." The old-fashioned trade unionist who wants to leave production questions to the management and concentrate only on wages and conditions is backed up by being told that for workers to concern themselves with managerial questions before the Socialist revolution is "class co-operation." We have got to explain to the average trade unionist that this chatter is not brave and advanced; that those who peddle it are people who are doing their damnedest to promote a Hitler victory, who have put it on record that they are not concerned with the fate of the Red Army, that a Second Front is of no importance, that they don't want to fight at all, and that increased production of war materials is treachery to the working class. At a meeting in a well-known Glasgow shipyard, a prominent supporter of "Left" Socialism declared that the workers should only concern themselves with wages and conditions and not bother with production because if there was "no war production there could be no war." Naturally, if society in the past had been so constituted that no war-like antagonisms were engendered, that no war production was undertaken, there would be no war. But of what consequence is this historical day-dreaming when there is a war? The aim of the I.L.P. steward was clear. It was to suggest to the shipbuilding workers in this yard that if they impeded production they would be making a contribution to the ending of the war on a working class basis, whereas it is perfectly clear that they would only be contributing to a Hitler victory and to the disappearance of the trade unions.

So far from the policy of the trade unions taking an interest in production involving a surrender of vital working class interests, it is the only possible policy which offers any hope of defending and improving the position of the working class in the midst of such a world upheaval. Whether we like it or not, we are in for vast changes in industry, which cannot be met by clinging to old customs and practices. Not by restrictive practices which are a relic of craft unionism, but by developing its industrial and political strength as a class will the workers defend their position during and after the war. And the working class will enormously increase its political and industrial strength, will add greatly to its influence over the intermediate strata if instead of hanging back it takes the lead in mobilising the people for an overwhelmingly powerful anti-Fascist war effort.

The "Lefts" also receive encouragement from those comrades in our own ranks who allow themselves to be dominated by their emotions instead of a careful analysis of the situation. As they watch the tremendous struggle of the Red Army and the refusal to form a second front, many people are driven to fury and demand a "People's government," etc. We welcome their eagerness for a new front to aid the Soviet Union. But can we get it by clamour for a people's government, which would exclude the parties in the existing coalition, or can we get it best by mobilising the people and forcing the existing Government to act? The latter is surely the only way to get Britain, in the shortest

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible time, to play the part of a full ally of the Soviet Union. This does not mean that we cannot strive for vast improvements in the coalition or for a change in personnel. It does not mean that we consider the present political groupings as static. Indeed, we hope to see the Labour movement strengthen itself in the Government and amongst the people on the basis of a more vigorous win the war policy. It is because it would stultify and not strengthen itself if it came out for a Labour or a People's Government that we oppose this policy. Impatience is always a poor substitute for reasoned analysis.

What we have said about the I.L.P. and other "Lefts" applies with greater force to the Trotskyists—the agents of the Gestapo in the Labour movement. From the moment that the Soviet Union was attacked, the vile anti-Soviet campaign of these loathsome political degenerates has redoubled in violence; nine-tenths of their papers are devoted to imitating Goebbels by depicting the Soviet Union in the most hideous form, and then in the other one-tenth may be found the slogan "Defend the Soviet Union." That these vile creatures, second only to the Fascists in their attitude to the Soviet Union, should be increasing their activity is a reproach to the British working class. It is time that we were ceasing to tolerate them. The Hess men of Trotsky, traitors of the Soviet Union, saboteurs of production, must be driven out of the workshops and of the Labour movement. Then cleansed of Fifth Column infection, the movement can go forward to lead the British people to victory over Fascism.

3 *new pamphlets:*

1 **PRODUCTION FRONT** *Maurice Dobb*

The well-known economist examines the war production problem and describes immediate, practical solutions. 24 pages **3d**

2 **RUBY STAR** *R. P. Dutt and Ivor Montagu*

Two inspiring writers on the meaning of the 1917 Revolution after 24 years to the peoples of the West, with the anniversary slogans of the C.P.S.U. (B) 16 pages **2d**

3 **DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND MODERN SCIENCE** *J. B. S. Haldane* **3d**

FROM Your newsagent or bookshop; or (post paid 1d extra on each) from

Publishers 'Labour Monthly' 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Liversidge Case

by "LAWYER"

THE House of Lords has recently decided by the vote of four judges (Maugham, MacMillan, Wright and Romer) to one (Atkin) that the true interpretation of Defence (General) Regulation 18B, by which power is given to the Home Secretary to intern any persons indefinitely, without charge or trial, *if he has reasonable ground to believe* certain things about them, is that the words quoted have the same meaning as *if he thinks he has reasonable ground to believe*.

The effect of this decision is that persons so interned have no right to test in the courts the question whether there is in fact any reasonable ground for the Home Secretary's belief (and therewith any legal basis for their internment), although they can go before tribunals which sit in secret, allow no legal representation, and have no power to make the Home Secretary follow their advice. The case raises interesting questions, both legal and political.

So far as the law goes, competent lawyers are substantially all agreed that Lord Atkin was right on the question of interpretation, and the four other judges wrong. The reasons given by the latter disclose indeed that they voted as they did because they thought that in war time Regulations should be interpreted so as to give the executive the maximum possible power.

But the conviction of lawyers that the majority view is wrong cannot have effect. The majority counts as right, and the decision binds every court before whom the interpretation of this Regulation may come. Only an Act of Parliament or an amendment of the Regulation can now secure that the law shall henceforth be what lawyers have hitherto thought that it was, i.e., that the Courts can test on evidence in an action the one question whether there are in fact any reasonable grounds for the Home Secretary's belief, that if there are such grounds the Home Secretary's decision to intern is not further challengeable, and that if there are no such grounds he must release the internee involved.

So much for the legal position, which is fairly simple. The important question is the political one. How far, and on what grounds, ought the position to be contested and some (and what) amendment demanded? Or rather, since a campaign for such amendment is already under way, how far should that campaign be supported, and should the challenge be extended beyond Regulation 18B to cover the whole field of Defence Regulations by which, generally with wording quite different from that of 18B, the powers of Ministers are rendered wholly or largely immune to challenge by the Courts. (In this wider field, of course, lies Regulation 2D, under which the *Daily Worker* was banned).

The existing campaign will no doubt be supported, for reasons of self-interest or tradition, not only by open or secret pro-Fascists, but by wide circles of Liberal or non-political opinion; but to reach a correct conclusion the matter has to be considered in the light of possible changes in the general situation. The most important object in the existing circumstances is of course to secure protection against Fascists and Fifth Column elements; and this can best be achieved by providing the fullest measure of popular control, direct or indirect, over the exercise of the Home Secretary's powers.

How is this to be done? At present, anti-Fascists and Fascists alike may from time to time be interned, or threatened with internment, or be seeking release from internment; and the question at each stage is what is the best authority, from a progressive point of view, to deal with them? To-day, the simple uncontrolled power of the present Home Secretary is definitely worse for the progressive forces, and better for those of reaction, than power which the same Home Secretary can only exercise subject to the check of judicial trial or enquiry held in open court, where the presence of the public constitutes a powerful if indirect element of popular control. But there may be changes in the elements of this comparison, either a different Home Secretary, or a reconstructed government with a more progressive general outlook. There may, too, be changes in the composition of the internees; with one change or an-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other in the international or domestic situation, the number of anti-Fascists and Fascists interned or released may rise or fall. Since the general complexion of the judges can alter only very slowly, a position may well arise in which a Home Secretary unchecked by the judges would be more favourable to the progressive forces and more opposed to Fascism than a Home Secretary subject to control by judges whose views were less progressive than his, even with the added safeguard of public trial.

What is the right course in the circumstances? Whatever may prove to be wisest in the future, I suggest that at present we ought to support a campaign on a wide front for the establishment of a reasonable measure of judicial control, involving public trial or enquiry, of the Home Secretary's present absolute power under all the Regulations. Only in that way have we the prospect of obtaining some improvement in the existing position, without any great probability of countervailing disadvantage.

A.R.P. Today

by J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.

THE attitude to A.R.P. is largely a reflection of one's attitude to other aspects of the war. Those who understand the new perils confronting the British people following Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, understand the need to prepare for big raids. In any case we may expect big air raids again as soon as slush and snow begin seriously to affect German aerodromes in the East. Had the Communist Party's policy of 1938 been carried out we should now have bomb-proof shelters for all in the target areas. But with the short time available, a programme of bomb-proof shelters is no longer the best way to use the available resources of labour and material so as to reduce to a minimum the social and industrial chaos caused by big raids.

We can demand that everyone in the most dangerous areas should have access to an Anderson, a steel-framed building, a tunnel or a reinforced shelter, such as have been made on a large scale in many parts of London. Some of these latter resemble those which were recommended two years ago by the A.R.P. Co-ordinating Committee as a first stage of bomb-proof shelters. We can also demand that all Anderson shelters should be waterproofed.

Since in some raids ten are bombed out for every casualty, the care of the homeless is as vital as the shelter problem, and much easier to tackle quickly. Large halls with unsupported walls should never be used as rest centres. Steel frame buildings should be taken over where reinforced shelters are not available. Arrangements should be made to take over solidly built hotels and restaurants for catering. More use should be made of mobile canteens.

Above all, transport should be ready in regional pools, not only to deal with the mass evacuation which follows heavy raids, but the even bigger problem raised by a raid with "mustard" or other persistent gas. Such a raid might render several square miles temporarily uninhabitable. Unless it were very quickly evacuated, there would be severe casualties from blistering, even if everyone had a gas mask and used it efficiently. The people should of course be warned that a gas raid may involve temporary evacuation.

Not only should rehousing be speeded up, and shelter-houses of solid construction made in the target areas, but stores of materials for rapid repairs should be accumulated in the neighbourhood of target areas.

The whole question of the welfare of the bombed out must be taken up more seriously in many areas. This can only be secured by co-operation. Local authorities must work together, since the refugees from a bombed city usually move out of the municipal area, and sometimes into another county. And the authorities in rural areas are particularly sticky about using large houses either for normal evacuees or the bombed out. The fullest use must also be made of organisations ranging from Trades Councils to Church Councils, from Boy Scouts to Communist Party Branches. During actual blitz conditions all these have played leading parts in different towns. But the time for preparation is obviously before the blitz.

Plans can only be made in advance

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Regional Commissioner is assisted by a very widely representative body. Such a body cannot of course deliberate during an actual raid, but it could and should meet beforehand, if only in order that members of the organizations represented should get in touch with one another before the emergency arises.

The lessons of the factories should be learnt in the Civil Defence Services. The workers can often trace the sources of inefficiency, but their voice is only heard if they are organised. To take one example, the Firemen's Charter would not only be a measure of justice to a body of brave men. It would considerably increase their efficiency in fire-fighting.

The Government has pointed out that some local authorities are very backward. Some have still not learned the need for static water supply and reinforcement of shelters. In others, business premises are still full of inflammable goods on upper floors. In many the preparations for feeding and rehousing exist on paper only. There is much corruption in connection with repairs.

These faults can only be countered by pressure from local democratic organisations and full efficiency can only be reached if such organisations play their part in A.R.P. wherever the local authorities allow them. The lull in air raids has caused a lamentable apathy. Every democrat should see that defects in his or her locality are remedied before heavy raiding begins again.

DOCUMENT OF THE MONTH

Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

Meetings of the first session of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, representing the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the British Trades Union Congress were held in Moscow from October 13 to 15. The Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee considered a number of vital problems facing the Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain in the present international situation. The delegations of the British Trade Unions and Soviet Trade Unions unanimously reached agreement concerning the definition of the basic tasks of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee and recognised these tasks to be as follows:—

1. Unity of the Trade Unions of Great Britain and the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union for the organisation of mutual assistance in the war against Hitlerite Germany.

2. Every assistance to the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and of Great Britain in their common war for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany.

3. Strengthening of the industrial efforts of both countries for the purpose of the utmost extension of the production of tanks, aeroplanes, guns, shells and other munitions.

4. Assistance in rendering maximum help to the Soviet Union in armaments on the part of Great Britain.

5. Utilisation of all means of agitation and propaganda — Press, radio, cinema, workers' meetings, etc.—for struggle against Hitlerism.

6. Every assistance to the peoples of the countries occupied by Hitlerite Germany, fighting for liberation from the Hitlerite yoke, for their independence and the re-establishment of their democratic liberties.

7. Organisation of mutual assistance and mutual information between the Trade Unions of Great Britain and the Soviet Trade Unions.

8. Strengthening of personal contact between the representatives of the Trade Union movements of the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain through the All-Union Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. and the British Trades Union Congress.

In addition, at the sitting of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, the Soviet delegation accepted the invitation of the British Trades Union Congress to send representatives of the Soviet Trades Unions to Great Britain. This delegation will acquaint itself with the struggle of the British people against Hitlerism and inform it about the struggle of the Soviet people against Nazi Germany. The question of the composition of the delegation will be considered within the next few days by the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

No More than a Quarry

A Short History of Science. By Charles Singer. (Oxford Clarendon Press. 8/6. 399 pp.)

A generation of scientists has admired Dr. Singer's studies of the documents from which our knowledge of ancient and mediæval science is derived. Hence a history of science by him is bound to be of value. But the value is unequal. The best section deals with the history of scientific books, but as an account of the development of scientific practice and theory, Dr. Singer's history is a failure. In his own opinion (p. 391) "a history of science is, in the strict sense of the word, hardly possible." It is impossible without a full knowledge of economic history. Thus Dr. Singer thinks that science declined under imperial Rome because it was the handmaid of practice. Actually Suetonius tells us that the emperor Vespasian turned down an invention for moving heavy weights because it would cause unemployment. Science declined because there was no social demand for it.

His account of mediæval science is simplified by leaving out its original achievements, such as Peter Peregrinus' work on the compass, and the introduction of the principle of virtual work in statics in the treatise attributed to Jordanus, besides such great technological leaps as weight-driven clocks, windmills, horse shoes and collars, and rudders. Hence the development of science at the Renaissance appears as a miracle. The account of modern biology from p. 358 on, is almost ludicrous. "A favourite theory of the nature of protoplasm" we read "regards it as a mixture of amino-acids." I have never met an adherent of this theory, nor heard of one. No wonder Dr. Singer has to take refuge in idealism from bogeys which he has imagined.

Serious students of the history of science will need this book, but as a quarry of material rather than a finished structure. As an introduction to its subject it is likely to produce as much confusion as enlightenment.

J. B. S. H.

SHORTER NOTICE

Those Raw Materials by C. A. Ward, A.M.I.E.E. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 15/-. 392 pp.)

This book attempts a comprehensive survey of the raw materials which form the basis of modern industrial production; what they are, where they occur and in what amount, how they are extracted and what they are used for. In fact, it is a digest in a quite readable form of the multitude of textbooks of technology and industrial practice that now exist. As such it has the inevitable drawback that space does not permit more than the baldest reference to many techniques, but the author has allowed for this by providing a detailed bibliography.

The treatment of the subject matter is not for the casual reader, but those who have already a general interest in the subject will find a large amount of information about industrial processes clearly presented.

D. P. R.

ALL BOOKS
MENTIONED IN LABOUR MONTHLY or any other paper can be obtained at
COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS,
66, CHARING CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C. 2
Temple Bar 6306
GLASGOW—1a, DUNDAS ST., C.I., DOUGLAS 1951
MANCHESTER—13/15a, HANGING DITCH, 4. BLACKFRIARS 8334
MAIL ORDER DEPARTMENT
67, GREAT RUSSELL ST., LONDON, W.C.I. HOLBORN 3222

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORGE YOUR WEAPONS

REPORTS are now coming in from all parts of the country telling us of increasing attendances at Discussion Group Meetings, of lively debates on to-day's key issues, of many and splendid pieces of activity by individual members inside their political party, trade union or workshop. Above all, it is plain that the special function of our Discussion Groups—to equip readers to find ways and arguments for convincing less advanced comrades of the right policy to follow in a difficult situation—is bringing results. A serious-minded man or woman is not content merely to possess knowledge and insight for their own sake: they are the means to influence others. Such influence is given and felt inside the Discussion Group; then, enriched by discussion, in the hundred and one ways which arise outside. Thus knowledge and ideas become potent weapons.

READER! Do *you* aid others—and yourself—in a Discussion Group?

NEW OR RE-ORGANISED GROUPS

Abertillery
Bilston
Buckhurst Hill
Batley
Calverley, Leeds
Clydebank
Claygate and Esher
Ilford
Lambeth
Letchworth
Leyton
Maghull, Liverpool
Mansfield
Medway Towns
Putney
Palmers Green
Porth, Glam.
South Kensington
Streatley and Goring
Stroud
Stapleford, Notts
Windsor
Worksop
Whetstone

GROUPS NOW BEING FORMED

Ashford, Kent
Rushden
Petersfield
Langold, Notts

PLEASE SEND STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE WITH ALL ENQUIRIES

DISCUSSION GUIDE—published monthly—invaluable to individuals as well as to Groups. Subscription: 3s. per annum

Discussion Groups Department:
LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR YOUR XMAS BOOK LIST

Chapayev *by Furmanov* 3/6 net

This cheap reprint of the famous story of *Chapayev*, guerilla leader of the Russian Civil War period, is an important contribution to working-class literature.

Russia Fights *by Michael MacAlpin*

The most stirring and authentic record of the Soviet Union's resistance to aggression. 1/6 *net*

How Moscow was Won in 1917

A further chapter in the history of the Revolution by the author of *October 1917*. 6d. *net* *by I. Mintz*

On Lenin *by Joseph Stalin*

A collection of writings and speeches on the leader of the Russian people which has important lessons for today. 6d. *net*

Dialectics of Nature *by F. Engels*

This classical work of Engels', hitherto only available at 15/-, is now being published in the *Marxist-Leninist Library* at 6/- *net*

We Are Many *by "Mother" Bloor*

This autobiography of a pioneer of the American Labour Movement is at the same time a history of working-class struggles during the period. 8/6 *net*

Lectures on Conditioned Reflexes

Volume 2 of the collected writings of the famous Soviet scientist now appears for the first time in England, together with a new edition of Volume 1, which has for some time been unobtainable. *by I. P. Pavlov*

Vol. 1, 12/6 *net*; Vol. 2, 8/6 *net*

U.S.S.R. the Strength of our Ally

This beautifully printed book answers all the questions people are asking today about the Soviet Union. *Factual* information is presented in text, photographs and thirty-one pages of pictorial statistics, mostly in two colours. 1/6 *net*

U.S.S.R. Speaks for Itself

The four volumes published in this series are sub-titled "*Industry*," "*Agriculture and Transport*," "*Democracy in Practice*," and "*Culture and Leisure*." Each is written by nine Soviet citizens who tell of their own particular work and life today in the U.S.S.R. as they themselves experience it. Each Volume, 2/6 *net*

LAWRENCE & WISHART, 2, Southampton Place, W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by The Hardy Press, Ltd., Commercial Road, Bournemouth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED